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Key Findings

Miller-Meeks Habitually Obscured Her Assets Even As She Used Her Wealth To Fuel Her Political Ambitions

When it comes to the financial transparency expected of – and in many cases, legally required of – our elected representatives, Mariannette Miller-Meeks has utterly failed. Miller-Meeks’ required financial disclosures have reported wildly different assessments of her wealth – fluctuating between $0 and nearly $2.5 million just in the same year. Miller-Meeks obscured millions in assets and income by under-reporting and misreporting required information. She filed false or incomplete information about a deferred compensation agreement and in 2020 she failed to report any assets at all, including her taxpayer-funded state senate income. The congresswoman’s amended reports raised new questions, appearing to show a violation of the cap on outside income and failing to properly report her deferred compensation and pension agreements.

And when the false information on her personal financial disclosure brought scrutiny from reporters, Miller-Meeks lied about her assets and income. In the face of growing questions about her personal finances, Miller-Meeks stated through a spokesperson, “I can confirm through the congresswoman that she does not have any outside income (IRAs/401ks)” and “she divested of those assets.” In fact, Miller-Meeks and her husband had retirement accounts worth up to $1,360,000 and total assets worth up to $2,615,000. Miller-Meeks’ claimed she did not receive any income from her previous employer in 2020, but she received more than $200,000. She even claimed she did not receive her pension in 2020, when she in fact received nearly $5,000.

All this as Miller-Meeks uses her shady personal wealth to fuel her political ambitions. In total, Miller-Meeks has loaned her campaigns more than $830,000, even as she faces mounting questions about her failure to properly account for her wealth as required by law and House ethics rules.

Miller-Meeks Was A Liar Who Pushed Delusional Election Conspiracy Theories And Sided With Violent Extremists

Just as Trump falsely questioned the legitimacy of the 2020 election, so too did Miller-Meeks, claiming she had been “cheated.” Miller-Meeks questioned the official results of the election as confirmed by recounts and precinct audits, claiming in June 2021 that she won by a larger margin and that “six is what they cheated me down to.” When her opponent filed an electoral challenge in the U.S. House in December 2020 in what was one of the closest House races in history, Miller-Meeks ironically accused Democrats challenging her victory of engaging in a “disinformation campaign” and threatening the public’s faith in elections.

But it’s not just about wild claims of fraud in the election she won – Miller-Meeks sided with Trump and others who have pushed the Big Lie and supported changes to election laws that have made it harder to vote. Miller-Meeks said, “there was fraud” and “there were irregularities” in the 2020 presidential election and called for an investigation, despite court decisions that found no such evidence. Even worse, Miller-Meeks accepted more than $50,000 in campaign contributions from members who objected to the 2020 Electoral College vote count. Miller-Meeks said she supported Iowa’s tighter absentee ballot deadlines that could affect the ability of seniors and servicemembers to vote and has repeatedly expressed support for other efforts to restrict voting laws. If Miller-Meeks has power in Washington, can you be sure your vote will count in future elections?

Miller-Meeks sided with the rioters who assaulted police at the Capitol on January 6. After her tone-deaf statement saying of the riot, “I think there is plenty of blame to go around to all of us,” Miller-Meeks voted against establishing a select committee to investigate the January 6th attack. She even voted against funding security upgrades to prevent future events like the January 6 insurrection, leaving Capitol police officers – and our democracy – at increased risk. Instead of siding with the brave police who put their lives on the line to defend her and her colleagues on January 6, Miller-Meeks expressed sympathy for the rioters, saying she did “understand the
anger” about January 6th insurrectionists awaiting court dates and promising that Republican control of the House would result in “a more fair investigation.”

Miller-Meeks disgraced herself and Iowa by speaking at a rally with white supremacist and Holocaust denier Nick Fuentes. When her actions came under fire, Miller-Meeks attempted to distance herself from Fuentes, but some felt her efforts “condemned Fuentes, but not his ideas.”

### Miller-Meeks’ Lies And Extreme Record Made Her A Threat To Iowans’ Health

Mariannette Miller-Meeks repeatedly spread misinformation about COVID-19 in ways that endangered the health of children and misled veterans about their earned benefits. In July 2021, Miller-Meeks falsely claimed elementary-school-aged children did not transmit COVID-19 to each other or adults, putting school reopening efforts at risk. Local newspapers called Miller-Meeks’ claim “patently false” and gave her “inaccurate” claim a grade of “D.” Miller-Meeks justified her opposition to mask-wearing with the patently false claim that COVID was not transmitted through the air. Then Miller-Meeks embarrassed herself yet again, spreading a false story from a clearly marked parody website about Biden ordering the VA to withhold benefits from unvaccinated veterans, adding “If true, this is insane!” Incredibly, Miller-Meeks stood by her decision to share misinformation that veterans’ benefits were at risk, claiming the false story made a “powerful point.” The false story was so widely shared after Miller-Meeks posted it that a Georgia VA hospital was forced to send an emergency alert, assuring veterans their benefits were not threatened.

Miller-Meeks mismanaged the Iowa Department of Public Health, which was plagued by controversies under her leadership, and Iowa taxpayers bore the cost. As director of the department, Miller-Meeks signed a secret $20,000 settlement with an employee who lost her job but filed a grievance stating that her termination was based on politics. Under her management, the department came under fire after a state audit report exposed the agency had failed to inspect funeral homes as required by state law causing Miller-Meeks to admit IDPH had not inspected funeral homes for “decades” prior to the audit. Miller-Meeks failed to stand up for HIV-positive Iowans when a federally funded high-risk insurance pool refused to provide health insurance to Iowans that were HIV-positive. Miller-Meeks even cut the position of Iowa’s Division of Tobacco Use Prevention and Control official and said the move was due to budget cuts that left the division too small to operate alone, but anti-smoking activists questioned the move, saying Miller-Meeks had spoken of her intent to dissolve the division entirely.

Miller-Meeks opposes the ACA and a woman’s right to choose, making her a threat to Iowans’ access to safe, affordable health care. Miller-Meeks was a staunch opponent of the Affordable Care Act which, if repealed, would strip protections for Iowans with pre-existing conditions and increase health insurance premiums. Miller-Meeks also flip-flopped on abortion. She claimed to be pro-choice in 2018, then in 2020 said she “misspoke” and “my record is 100 percent pro-life.” Miller-Meeks’ 2022 vote against codifying the protections of Roe v. Wade has since cleared up any confusion about just how much of a threat she represents to a woman’s right to choose. She made multiple false claims about Roe v. Wade, saying the ruling permitted abortion on demand up to birth (though it allowed abortion bans post-viability) and that it was “only temporary” and “only until women have access to birth control.” Miller-Meeks voted for a state HHS appropriations bill that prohibited grant funding for Planned Parenthood and said that Planned Parenthood was “synonymous” with abortion.

### Miller-Meeks Was A Threat To Iowans’ Jobs, Economy, And Retirement Security

Miller-Meeks stuck with her partisan allies and flip-flopped on infrastructure, opposing millions in investments in Iowa jobs and economic development. Miller-Meeks advocated for a bipartisan infrastructure bill in 2020 and 2021 – then voted against the Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill granting Iowa millions of dollars for bridge repair. Miller-Meeks voted no, even as her congressional district had the second-most troubled bridges in the country, including key bridges connecting the Quad Cities and a bridge linking a key freight route. The Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act “would pour more than $100 million in federal money to repair and replace bridges into southwest Iowa.”
…Then she tried to “vote no and take the dough.” In December 2021, after voting to deny her constituents this game-changing investment, Miller-Meeks joined a letter asking for funds from the Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill to be allocated to river locks and dams in Iowa. Just days after voting against infrastructure, she wrote an op-ed touting the “opportunity to invest in infrastructure we have long known was in need of repair.” In total, Miller-Meeks voted against over $30 million in earmarks she requested for local projects, all part of a shameless effort to get credit for investments in the district even as she joined her partisan allies in voting against them.

**Miller-Meeks is a threat to the retirement security of Iowa seniors.** Miller-Meeks said she opposed allowing Medicare to negotiate lower prescription drug prices and falsely claimed that government involvement in drug pricing would lead to rationing of care and restricted access to certain medications. Miller-Meeks voted against measures to raise the debt limit hours before the United States would have defaulted, threatening $20 billion in Social Security payments for seniors. Miller-Meeks also voted against legislation preventing Medicare cuts and supported a plan to turn Medicare into a voucher program, agreeing that a premium support plan “may not be politically correct, but it is medically correct.”
Thematics
Miller-Meeks Habitually Obscured Her Assets Even As She Used Her Wealth To Fuel Her Political Ambitions

**Significant Findings**

During Her Campaigns For Congress, Miller-Meeks’ Reported Net Worth Fluctuated Between $0 And Nearly $2.5 Million, But She Loaned Her Campaigns More Than $830,000.

✓ 2009-2021: Miller-Meeks’ reported net worth fluctuated between $0 and $2,414,999, with both values being reported in personal financial disclosures filed in 2021.

✓ 2009-2022: Miller-Meeks loaned $833,770.76 to her own campaigns.

   ✓ 2020: Miller-Meeks loaned $195,000 to her own campaign while reporting a net worth between $201,003 and $515,000.

   ✓ 2010: Miller-Meeks loaned more than $590,000 to her own campaign shortly after reporting a net worth between $276,268 and $1,342,000.

Miller-Meeks Obscured Millions Of Dollars In Assets And Income On Her Personal Financial Disclosures And Lied About Whether Those Assets Existed At All.

✓ Miller-Meeks appeared to hide hundreds of thousands of dollars in assets and income on her 2020 personal financial disclosure.

   ✓ 2019: Miller-Meeks reported owning between $202,002 and $515,000 in assets in three accounts.

      ✓ Miller-Meeks’ Voya Financial account appeared to be coded or described incorrectly.

   ✓ 2020: Miller-Meeks did not disclose any assets and failed to report her state Senate income.

      ✓ Miller-Meeks failed to disclose her $25,000 annual salary from serving in the state Senate in 2020.

      ✓ Miller-Meeks claimed to have divested of her assets before joining Congress, but she was still required to report them in her financial disclosure because the filing covered calendar year 2020.

      ✓ Miller-Meeks was required to report her bank accounts if they totaled more than $5,000 or if any account generated more than $200 in interest.

✓ Miller-Meeks filed false or incomplete information about her deferred compensation agreement with her previous employer.

   ✓ 2020: Miller-Meeks reported receiving at least $5,000 in deferred compensation from her previous employer, but her spokesperson said she did not receive any income from the organization.
- Miller-Meeks improperly disclosed the income received through her deferred compensation agreement with Great River Health System.
- Miller-Meeks failed to properly report her deferred compensation agreement on Schedule F of her personal financial disclosure.
- After her first personal financial disclosure filing raised questions from local reporters, Miller-Meeks lied about her assets and income.
- Miller-Meeks’ spokesperson said she had no outside income, including IRAs or 401(k)s, that were required to be publicly disclosed, and claimed she had divested of her assets before joining Congress.
- Miller-Meeks’ spokesperson: “I can confirm through the congresswoman that she does not have any outside income (IRAs /401ks)” and “she divested of those assets.”
- Miller-Meeks and her husband actually had retirement accounts worth up to $1,360,000 and total assets worth up to $2,615,000.
- Miller-Meeks reported an IRA withdrawal of $100,000 as income.
- Miller-Meeks’ spokesperson said she did not receive any income from her previous employer in 2020, but she actually received more than $200,000.
- Miller-Meeks’ spokesperson claimed she did not receive her pension in 2020, but she actually received nearly $5,000.
- On her amended PFD, Miller-Meeks appeared to have violated the House Ethics cap on outside income and failed to properly report her deferred compensation agreement with her previous employer.
- Miller-Meeks appeared to receive more than $31,000 in qualified outside income in 2021, which would violate a House Ethics rule prohibiting members from earning outside income above a set threshold.
- Miller-Meeks again failed to properly report her deferred compensation and pension agreements with her previous employers on Schedule F of her personal financial disclosure.

### 2009-2021: Miller-Meeks’ Reported Net Worth Repeatedly Fluctuated By Hundreds Of Thousands Of Dollars, Sometimes As Low As $0


**2021:** Miller-Meeks Reported An Estimated Net Worth Of $0. [Miller-Meeks 2021 Personal Financial Disclosure New Filer Report, filed 8/13/21]


**2019:** Miller-Meeks Reported An Estimated Net Worth Between $201,003 And $515,000. [Miller-Meeks 2019 Personal Financial Disclosure Report, filed 12/1/19]
2014: Miller-Meeks Reported An Estimated Net Worth Between $1,001 And $15,000. [Miller-Meeks 2014 Personal Financial Disclosure Report, filed 5/2/14]


2009-2022: Miller-Meeks Loaned $833,770.76 To Her Own Campaigns

2022: Over Her Five Runs For Congress, Miller-Meeks Had Loaned $833,770.76 To Her Own Congressional Campaigns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miller-Meeks Loans Made By Candidate</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Election Cycle</td>
<td>Election Type</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>$25,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>$543,670.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td></td>
<td>$833,770.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[FEC Committee Candidate and Committee Viewer, accessed 3/3/22]

2020: Miller-Meeks Loaned $195,000 To Her Own Campaign While Reporting A Net Worth Between $201,003 And $515,000

2020: Miller-Meeks Loaned $195,000 To Her Campaign. [FEC Committee Candidate and Committee Viewer, accessed 3/3/22]

- October 2020: Miller-Meeks Loaned $100,000 To Her Campaign. [FEC Committee Candidate and Committee Viewer, 10/26/20]

- March 2020: Miller-Meeks Loaned $95,000 To Her Campaign. [FEC Committee Candidate and Committee Viewer, 3/31/20]


2010: Miller-Meeks Loaned More Than $590,000 To Her Own Campaign Shortly After Reporting A Net Worth Between $276,268 And $1,342,000

2010: Miller-Meeks Loaned $593,670.76 To Her Campaign. [FEC Committee Candidate and Committee Viewer, accessed 3/3/22]


Miller-Meeks Appeared To Hide Hundreds Of Thousands Of Dollars In Assets And Income On Her 2020 Personal Financial Disclosure
2019: Miller-Meeks Reported Owning Between $202,002 And $515,000 In Assets In Three Accounts

- **Miller-Meeks Reported A Vanguard Money Market Account As An IRA Held In Cash Valued At $100,001-$250,000.** [House Ethics Committee, Amended 2019 Personal Financial Disclosure: Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Filed 5/27/20]

- **Miller-Meeks Reported A Vanguard Roth IRA As An IRA Held In Cash Valued At $1,001-$15,000.** [House Ethics Committee, Amended 2019 Personal Financial Disclosure: Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Filed 5/27/20]

- **Miller-Meeks Reported A Voya Financial Account Valued At $100,001-$250,000.** [House Ethics Committee, Amended 2019 Personal Financial Disclosure: Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Filed 5/27/20]

**Miller-Meeks’ Voya Financial Account Appeared To Be Coded Or Described Incorrectly**

- **Miller-Meeks Reported A Voya Financial Account Valued At $100,001-$250,000.** [House Ethics Committee, Amended 2019 Personal Financial Disclosure: Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Filed 5/27/20]

- **Miller-Meeks Described The Account As “Stocks” But Coded The Asset As “Mutual Funds.”** [House Ethics Committee, Amended 2019 Personal Financial Disclosure: Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Filed 5/27/20]


**Stocks, Mutual Funds, And 401(k) Accounts Have Distinct Asset Type Codes For Financial Disclosure Reporting.** [United States House Of Representatives, Accessed 8/23/21]

2020: Miller-Meeks Did Not Disclose Any Assets And Failed To Report Her State Senate Income

- **2020: Miller-Meeks Reported No Assets.** [House Ethics Committee, 2020 Personal Financial Disclosure: Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Filed 8/13/21]

**Miller-Meeks Failed To Disclose Her $25,000 Annual Salary From Serving In The State Senate In 2020**

- **Cedar Rapids Gazette: In Her 2020 PFD, “Miller-Meeks Did Not List Her $25,000 Annual Salary From The Iowa Senate, Where She Served From January 2019 To January 2021.”** “Miller-Meeks did not list her $25,000 annual salary from the Iowa Senate, where she served from January 2019 to January 2021. Will Kiley, a spokesman for Miller-Meeks, said Wednesday his boss now is working with the House to update her form to add her Iowa Senate salary. He said Miller-Meeks does not have any outside income, including from IRAs or 401(k)s, that she would be required to report on the form.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 9/17/21]

- **Ottumwa Courier: In Her 2020 Personal Financial Disclosure, Miller-Meeks “Did Not Disclose Any Salary As A Former State Senator, Which Carried A $25,000 Annual Salary.”** “In her 2020 disclosure, Miller-Meeks reported $100,000 in salary from her time as a current representative, but did not disclose any salary as a former state senator, which carried a $25,000 annual salary.” [Ottumwa Courier, 9/17/21]
Miller-Meeks Claimed To Have Divested Of Her Assets Before Joining Congress, But She Was Still Required To Report Them In Her Financial Disclosure Because The Filing Covered Calendar Year 2020

Miller-Meeks’ Spokesperson Said She “Does Not Have Any Outside Income” And “Divested Of [Her] Assets” Before Joining Congress. “‘I can confirm through the Congresswoman that she does not have any outside income (IRAs/401ks),’ according to the spokesperson. ‘The Congresswoman said she divested of those assets (stocks, etc.) before she became a (House) Member. The income reported includes 2021 congressional pay, and the Congresswoman is already working with the House to ensure the filing is complete.’” [Quad-City Times, 9/15/21]

The Only Income Miller-Meeks Reported Was Her 2021 Congressional Salary Despite The Fact That The Reporting Year For The Disclosure Form Was 2020, Not 2021. “Democrats are raising questions about Iowa freshman Republican U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks’ finances – or apparent lack thereof. Miller-Meeks’ personal financial disclosure form, which she filed with the Clerk of House on Aug. 13, is notably scarce. The only financial information listed on the form is Miller-Meeks’ $100,000 salary as a member of Congress (that despite the report intended to cover the previous full year’s finances for 2020; Miller-Meeks did not become a member of Congress until 2021) and a deferred compensation payout from Great River Health System in Burlington, where Miller-Meeks worked as an ophthalmologist before being elected to Congress. The report, which is required annually of all House members and congressional candidates, does not list the mount of the payout, only that the compensation exceeds $5,000.” [Quad-City Times, 9/15/21]

House Ethics Committee Guidelines Stated That The Reporting Period For New Members Was Calendar Year 2020. “New Members: New Members (i.e., those sworn in between November 4, 2020, and April 15, 2021) must file on or before May 17, 2021. New Members must complete Schedules A, C, D, E, F, and J in the online filing system or a paper Form B. […] The reporting period for New Members, as defined on page 2, is calendar year 2020.” [U.S. House Of Representative Committee On Ethics, Accessed 9/16/21]

Miller-Meeks Was Required To Report Her Bank Accounts If They Totaled More Than $5,000 Or If Any Account Generated More Than $200 In Interest

House Ethics Rules Required Members To Disclose Bank Accounts Valued At More Than $1,000 If The Total Value Of All Bank Accounts Was More Than $5,000. “Bank Accounts. In order to determine whether deposits in a bank account must be disclosed, you must first add together all interest-bearing checking and savings accounts held by you, your spouse, or a dependent child at every financial institution in which you have such accounts. If the total value of these accounts exceeded $5,000 at the end of the reporting period, then you must disclose each financial institution that held deposits valued at more than $1,000. You must also report any interest-bearing account that generated more than $200 in interest during the reporting period, even if it was valued at less than $1,000 at the close of the reporting period or your total deposits were less than $5,000.” [U.S. House Of Representative Committee On Ethics, Accessed 9/16/21]

House Ethics Rules Required Members To Disclose Bank Accounts Generating More Than $200 In Interest Regardless Of The Account’s Value. “Bank Accounts. In order to determine whether deposits in a bank account must be disclosed, you must first add together all interest-bearing checking and savings accounts held by you, your spouse, or a dependent child at every financial institution in which you have such accounts. If the total value of these accounts exceeded $5,000 at the end of the reporting period, then you must disclose each financial institution that held deposits valued at more than $1,000. You must also report any interest-bearing account that generated more than $200 in interest during the reporting period, even if it was valued at less than $1,000 at the close of the reporting period or your total deposits were less than $5,000.” [U.S. House Of Representative Committee On Ethics, Accessed 9/16/21]

Miller-Meeks Misreported Or Lied About A Deferred Compensation Agreement With Her Previous Employer
On Her Personal Financial Disclosure, Miller-Meeks Reported Receiving At Least $5,000 From Great River Health System, But Her Spokesperson Said She Did Not Receive Any Income From The Organization. “The only financial information listed on the form is Miller-Meeks’ $100,000 salary as a member of Congress (that despite the report intended to cover the previous full year’s finances for 2020; Miller-Meeks did not become a member of Congress until 2021) and a deferred compensation payout from Great River Health System in Burlington, where Miller-Meeks worked as an ophthalmologist before being elected to Congress. The report, which is required annually of all House members and congressional candidates, does not list the mount of the payout, only that the compensation exceeds $5,000. […] A spokesperson for Miller-Meeks’ office said Miller-Meeks did not receive any income – salary or benefits – from Great River Health System and did not receive her pension from the Iowa Public Employees Retirement System in 2020.” [Quad-City Times, 9/15/21]

Miller-Meeks Improperly Disclosed The Income Received Through Her Deferred Compensation Agreement With Great River Health System


NOTE: The reporting period of Schedule J for first-year members was 2019-2021, but Miller-Meeks did not report any deferred compensation payout or agreement in her previous PFD and was still employed by Great River Health System at the time, indicating that the payout agreement was established sometime after May 15, 2020 (the end of her self-described filing period in her 2019 PFD).

Schedule J Was For Compensation Received By “Personally Perform[ing] Services For Clients […] That Generated Fees For Your Employer” And Applied “Only If You Have An Ownership Interest In The Employer.” “SCHEDULE J COMPENSATION IN EXCESS OF $5,000 PAID BY ONE SOURCE This schedule must be completed by new Members, new employees, and candidates only. If you were employed in a position in which you personally performed services for clients in either of the two preceding calendar years that generated fees for your employer in excess of $5,000, you must identify each of those clients. This requirement applies only if you have an ownership interest in the employer. For example, if you were a partner or member (but not an associate) of a law firm, accounting firm, or lobbying firm, you must disclose the clients or customers of your firm to whom you personally provided services which generated fees in excess of $5,000. The clients or customers of a filer who was the sole proprietor of a business or other professional practice must also be disclosed in the same manner.” [U.S. House Of Representative Committee On Ethics, Accessed 9/16/21]

Miller-Meeks’ Compensation From Great River Health System Should Have Been Filed On Schedule C Of Her Personal Financial Disclosure Rather Than Schedule J. “You must disclose the following types of earned income which meet the reporting thresholds above: • Earned income from any source other than your current U.S. government employment. • Pension and retirement payments from any source other than the U.S. government or Social Security. • IRA and 401(k) distributions. • Benefits payments from state or local governments, such as unemployment compensation […] Certain types of earned income, such as pensions from prior employers or deferred compensation for services rendered prior to current legislative employment, do not count against the outside earned income limit for the current year. Nonetheless, such income must be reported on Schedule C.” [U.S. House Of Representative Committee On Ethics, Accessed 9/16/21]

Miller-Meeks Failed To Properly Report Her Deferred Compensation Agreement On Schedule F Of Her Personal Financial Disclosure


House Ethics Rules Required Members To Report On Schedule F Any “Continuing Compensation
Payments, Such As A Buyout Agreement, Severance Payments, Or Payments Not Yet Received For Previous Work.” “You must report on Schedule F the parties to and general terms of the following types of agreements: […] For all types of employers, continuing compensation payments, such as a buyout agreement, severance payments, or payments not yet received for previous work.” [U.S. House Of Representative Committee On Ethics, Accessed 9/16/21]
Miller-Meeks And Her Husband Actually Had Retirement Accounts Worth Up To $1,360,000 And Total Assets Worth Up To $2,615,000

On Her Amended 2020 PFD, Miller-Meeks Disclosed A Retirement Account Managed By TIAA-CREF Worth Up To $1,030,000. [House Ethics Committee, Amended 2020 Personal Financial Disclosure: Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Filed 10/28/21]

On Her Amended 2020 PFD, Miller-Meeks Disclosed A 401(k) Through Her Previous Employer Worth Up To $250,000. [House Ethics Committee, Amended 2020 Personal Financial Disclosure: Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Filed 10/28/21]

On Her Amended 2020 PFD, Miller-Meeks Disclosed A Non-Deductible Traditional IRA Worth Up To $50,000. [House Ethics Committee, Amended 2020 Personal Financial Disclosure: Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Filed 10/28/21]

On Her Amended 2020 PFD, Miller-Meeks Disclosed Two Roth IRAs Managed By Vanguard For Herself And Her Husband Worth Up To $30,000 Total. [House Ethics Committee, Amended 2020 Personal Financial Disclosure: Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Filed 10/28/21]

According To Her Amended 2020 PFD, Miller-Meeks’ Total Assets Were Worth Up To $2,615,000. [House Ethics Committee, Amended 2020 Personal Financial Disclosure: Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Filed 10/28/21]

Des Moines Register: Miller-Meeks Amended Report Disclosed “Between $880,000 And $2.6 Million In Assets In Retirement Accounts, As Well As Salaries From The State Of Iowa And Previous Employer Great River Health Systems.” “According to the new report, Miller-Meeks' financial disclosures include between $880,000 and $2.6 million in assets in retirement accounts, as well as salaries from the state of Iowa and previous employer Great River Health Systems, and a mortgage on her Ottumwa residence.” [Des Moines Register, 11/19/21]

2021: Miller-Meeks Reported An IRA Withdrawal Of $100,000 As Income

On Her Amended 2020 PFD, Miller-Meeks Disclosed A Withdrawal Of $100,000 From A Vanguard Equity Income IRA. [House Ethics Committee, Amended 2020 Personal Financial Disclosure: Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Filed 10/28/21]

Miller-Meeks’ Spokesperson Said She Did Not Receive Any Income From Her Previous Employer In 2020, But She Actually Received More Than $200,000 That Year

Miller-Meeks’ Spokesperson Said She Did Not Receive Any Income From Great River Health System In 2020. “A spokesperson for Miller-Meeks’ office said Miller-Meeks did not receive any income – salary or benefits – from Great River Health System and did not receive her pension from the Iowa Public Employees Retirement System in 2020.” [Quad-City Times, 9/15/21]

On Her Amended 2020 PFD, Miller-Meeks Disclosed Receiving $209,774 In Income From Great River Health System In 2020 And $53,848 In 2021. [House Ethics Committee, Amended 2020 Personal Financial Disclosure: Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Filed 10/28/21]

After Previously Claiming She Had No Outside Income Or Assets, Miller-Meeks Amended Her Personal Financial Disclosure To Report Up To $2.6 Million In Assets And Hundreds Of Thousands Of Dollars In Income From Her Previous Employers. “A spokesman for Miller-Meeks in September said she did not have any outside income, including from IRAs or 401(k)s, that she would be required to report on the form. […] However, in her amended filing, Miller-Meeks reported receiving nearly $54,000 in salary from Great River Health Systems.
She also reported receiving $31,000 in salary from the state of Iowa for serving in the Iowa Senate. Miller-Meeks in her amended 2020 disclosure report, which covers Jan. 1, 2020 to Aug. 14, 2021, also reported: She and her husband owned retirement accounts worth up to $1.36 million and total assets worth up to more than $2.6 million. An IRA withdrawal of $100,000 listed as income; Assets worth up to $300,000 from ‘deferred salary’ from Great River Health Systems; $5,000 in income from her state pension; $200 from the Wapello County Board of Veterans Affairs as board commissioner” [Quad-City Times, 11/16/21]

**Miller-Meeks’ Spokesperson Claimed She Did Not Receive Her Pension In 2020, But She Actually Received Nearly $5,000**

Miller-Meeks’ Spokesperson Said She Did Not Receive Her Pension From The Iowa Public Employees Retirement System In 2020. “A spokesperson for Miller-Meeks’ office said Miller-Meeks did not receive any income – salary or benefits – from Great River Health System and did not receive her pension from the Iowa Public Employees Retirement System in 2020.” [Quad-City Times, 9/15/21]

On Her Amended 2020 PFD, Miller-Meeks Disclosed Receiving $4,972 In Income From Her State Pension In 2020 And $4,973 In 2021. [House Ethics Committee, Amended 2020 Personal Financial Disclosure: Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Filed 10/28/21]

**On Her Amended PFD, Miller-Meeks Appeared To Have Violated The House Ethics Cap On Outside Income And Failed To Properly Report Her Deferred Compensation Agreement With Her Previous Employer**

Miller-Meeks Appeared To Receive More Than $31,000 In Qualified Outside Income In 2021, Which Would Violate A House Ethics Rule Prohibiting Members From Earning Outside Income Above A Set Threshold

On Her Amended 2020 PFD, Miller-Meeks Disclosed Receiving $31,281 In Salary From The State Of Iowa And $200 From The Wapello County Board Of Veterans Affairs In 2021. [House Ethics Committee, Amended 2020 Personal Financial Disclosure: Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Filed 10/28/21]

Members Of The House Were Prohibited From Earning More Than $29,595 In Outside Income In 2021. “The outside earned income of Members, officers, and employees paid at or above the ‘senior staff’ rate ($131,239 in 2020 and $132,552 in 2021) for more than 90 days in a calendar year is subject to an annual earned income limit of 15 percent of the Executive Level II salary. For calendar year 2020, the outside earned income cap for Members and senior staff is $28,845 (for 2021 the cap is $29,595).” [House Ethics Committee, Accessed 11/9/21]

**Miller-Meeks’ Campaign Did Not Clarify Which Years She Was Reporting Outside Earned Income From**

Miller-Meeks’ Spokesman Said She Claimed Not To Have Income That She Subsequently Reported Because “There Was A Simple Misunderstanding With Regards To What Was Required To Be Disclosed.” “Asked why the congresswoman claimed not to have income that she has subsequently reported, Kiley responded in an email, ‘There was a simple misunderstanding with regards to what was required to be disclosed.’” [Quad-City Times, 11/16/21]

Miller-Meeks’ Spokesman Did Not Respond To Questions To Clarify For Which Years Miller-Meeks Was Reporting Outside Earned Income. “Kiley did not respond to emailed questions asking to clarify for which years Miller-Meeks was reporting earned income. For example, she listed nearly $210,000 in salary from her Great River Health System for the ‘preceding year’ and nearly $54,000 in salary from her previous employer for the ‘current year.’ She also listed receiving her $31,000 annual Iowa Senate salary for the ‘current year,’ despite resigning the
• Miller-Meeks Reported Receiving $31,000 In Salary From The Iowa Senate In 2021 Despite Resigning The Seat To Join Congress In January. “Kiley did not respond to emailed questions asking to clarify for which years Miller-Meeks was reporting earned income. For example, she listed nearly $210,000 in salary from her Great River Health System for the ‘preceding year’ and nearly $54,000 in salary from her previous employer for the ‘current year.’ She also listed receiving her $31,000 annual Iowa Senate salary for the ‘current year,’ despite resigning the seat to join Congress in January of this year.” [Quad-City Times, 11/16/21]

Quad-City Times: “Miller-Meeks Appeared To Receive More Than $31,000 In Qualified Outside Income In 2021” Which Would Violate “House Ethics Rules Prohibiting Members Of Congress From Earning Outside Income Above A Set Threshold.” “All told, Miller-Meeks appeared to receive more than $31,000 in qualified outside income in 2021, which would violate a House ethics rules prohibiting members of Congress from earning outside income above a set threshold. For the 2021 calendar year, the income cap for members is $29,595.” [Quad-City Times, 11/16/21]

• Miller-Meeks Again Failed To Properly Report Her Deferred Compensation And Pension Agreements With Her Previous Employers On Schedule F Of Her Personal Financial Disclosure


On Her Amended 2020 PFD, Miller-Meeks Disclosed Receiving $4,972 In Income From Her State Pension In 2020 And $4,973 In 2021. [House Ethics Committee, Amended 2020 Personal Financial Disclosure: Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Filed 10/28/21]


• Miller-Meeks Previously Did Not Disclose Any Agreements On Schedule F Of Her Original 2020 PFD. [House Ethics Committee, 2020 Personal Financial Disclosure: Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Filed 8/13/21]

House Ethics Rules Required Members To Report On Schedule F Any “Continuing Compensation Payments, Such As A Buyout Agreement, Severance Payments, Or Payments Not Yet Received For Previous Work.” “You must report on Schedule F the parties to and general terms of the following types of agreements: […] For all types of employers, continuing compensation payments, such as a buyout agreement, severance payments, or payments not yet received for previous work.” [U.S. House Of Representative Committee On Ethics, Accessed 9/16/21]

House Ethics Rules Required Members To Report On Schedule F Any “Continued Participation In A Benefit Program, Such As Life Or Health Insurance, 401(k), Or A Pension Or Profit-Sharing Plan.” “You must report on Schedule F the parties to and general terms of the following types of agreements: […] For any employer other than the U.S. government, for your continued participation in a benefit program, such as life or health insurance, 401(k), or a pension or profit-sharing plan.” [U.S. House Of Representative Committee On Ethics, Accessed 9/16/21]

Miller-Meeks Said Republicans Were Better Than Democrats At Holding Their Members Of Congress Accountable And That There Was An Erosion Of Faith In Government

Miller-Meeks: “It Seems To Me That Republicans Do A Better Job Of Holding Their Members Of Congress Accountable Than Democrats.” At a Muscatine County GOP Forum, Miller-Meeks was asked “What measures
would you propose to strengthen ethics rules and help restore the public’s confidence in their government? “Miller-Meeks responded “And the other thing, it seems to me that Republicans do a better job of holding their members of Congress accountable than Democrats. We’ve seen that in, you know, members within our own state losing committee memberships, investigations that take place now rightly so. Looking at members of Congress that may have unethical conduct or behavior, we’ve seen politicians from nearby states who have, you know, lost committees lost memberships, or were not supported in their bids for re-election. And I think those instances where I find that the Republican Party seems to hold their members more accountable than the Democrat Party, certainly having a media that holds everyone accountable, no matter what party you’re.” [Muscatine County GOP Forum, 5/26/20] (VIDEO) 01:16:23

March 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against The For the People Act, Expanding Access To Voting And Overhauling Campaign Finance And Ethics Laws. In March 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against The For The People Act. NPR described the bill: “The [For The People Act] seeks ‘to expand Americans' access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and implement other anti-corruption measures for the purpose of fortifying our democracy, and for other purposes.’ The bill's language calls for a complete overhaul of the current system, which varies widely by state and which critics say promotes unfair barriers to voting. Included in the act is mandatory automatic voter registration, restoring voting rights to people with completed felony sentences and a reversal of state voter ID laws that would allow citizens to make a sworn statement affirming their identity if they were unable to produce an ID. [...] in politics by requiring organizations to disclose large donors, and it creates a matching system for small donations.” The motion was agreed to 220 - 210. [HR 1, Vote #62, 3/3/21; CQ, 3/3/21; NPR, 3/3/21]

Miller-Meeks Said There Was An Erosion In Faith The Government. “People want to get ahead, they want government that can be trusted and accountable,’ she said Monday. ‘There’s been such an erosion in our faith in institutions and our faith in government. People who have real-world experience, who have struggled, who have been knocked down and get back up, who keep trying, are raising a family, trying to make ends meet don’t want the same politics as usual.‘” [The Gazette, 10/1/19]
Miller-Meeks Was A Liar Who Pushed Delusional Election Conspiracy Theories And Sided With Violent Extremists

Significant Findings

Miller-Meeks Used “Big Lie” Rhetoric To Question The Results Of Her Own 2020 Election, Claiming She Was “Cheated Down” To A Six-Vote Margin.

✓ Miller-Meeks trafficked in “Big Lie” rhetoric in questioning her own election results, claiming she had been “cheated down” to a six-vote margin.

✓ Miller-Meeks questioned the official results of the election as confirmed by recounts and precinct audits, claiming in June 2021 that she won by a larger margin and that “six is what they cheated me down to.”

✓ Citing a “haphazard” state recount, Hart filed an electoral challenge in the U.S. House in December 2020, forcing Miller-Meeks to be seated provisionally the following month; Hart did not withdraw her election challenge and concede to Miller-Meeks until March 2021.

✓ Hart’s campaign identified 22 ballots they believed were legally cast but wrongly uncounted.

✓ Miller-Meeks accused Democrats challenging her victory of engaging in a “disinformation campaign” and threatening the public’s faith in elections.

✓ Miller-Meeks later backtracked and said she did not think there had been any fraud in her 2020 election.

Miller-Meeks Claimed There Was Fraud In The 2020 Presidential Election And Sided With Trump And Members Of Congress Who Propagated The Big Lie And Tried To Overturn The Election.

✓ Miller-Meeks said “there was fraud” and “there were irregularities” in the 2020 presidential election and called for an investigation, despite court decisions that found no such evidence.

✓ Miller-Meeks accepted more than $50,000 in campaign contributions from members who objected to the 2020 Electoral College vote count.

✓ October 2021: Miller-Meeks appeared at public events with Trump where he falsely claimed he was the rightful President.

Miller-Meeks Praised Iowa’s Election Law Changes That Made It Harder To Vote And Said Those Changes Allowed Iowans To Trust Election Results.

✓ Miller-Meeks said Iowans could trust election results “because of the election law changes we have made in Iowa in the past three years.”

✓ Miller-Meeks said she supported Iowa’s tighter absentee ballot deadlines and voter ID laws, the latter of which she called “highly supported by the public.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 2021:</td>
<td>Miller-Meeks said she supported Republican proposals for a “federal baseline” for vote-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by-mail and the possibility of nationally adopting voter ID laws.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2020:</td>
<td>Miller-Meeks signed a letter calling for a House investigation into “voting irregularities,”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>which she said was in error, then refused to offer a stance on the effort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miller-Meeks made contradictory statements about federal control of elections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Miller-Meeks Sided With The Rioters Who Assaulted Police At The Capitol On January 6, Voting</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Against A Select Committee To Investigate The Attack And Sympathizing With Those Awaiting</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Trial.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2021:</td>
<td>Miller-Meeks voted against objecting to the counting of 2020 electoral votes from key states.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Miller-Meeks had previously said “I have suspicions about the integrity of the votes cast in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ several states” in her statement released on the scheduled vote to certify.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021:</td>
<td>Miller-Meeks voted against establishing a select committee to investigate January 6th attack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ following the failure to establish a bipartisan commission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Miller-Meeks said that a January 6th Select Committee would be “another partisan, political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ hack job” and compared it to the house investigation of Russian election interference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ NOTE: Miller-Meeks voted FOR establishing a bipartisan commission to investigate the January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ 6th attack on the US Capitol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2022:</td>
<td>Miller-Meeks voted against funding security upgrades to prevent future events like the January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 insurrection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2022:</td>
<td>Miller-Meeks said she did “understand the anger” about January 6th insurrectionists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>awaiting court dates and that Republican control of the House would result in “a more fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>investigation.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2021:</td>
<td>Miller-Meeks voted against impeaching Trump for incitement of an insurrection and said</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ impeachment “would create a bigger wedge and divide in our country.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Miller-Meeks said impeaching Trump in January 2021 would “only further divide the nation”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ and “there are other ways to hold the president accountable.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Miller-Meeks voted against the resolution calling on vice president pence to invoke the 25th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ amendment and remove Trump from office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Miller-Meeks Spoke At A Rally With White Supremacist Nick Fuentes And Compared The January 6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Insurrection To Racial Justice Protests In 2020.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019:</td>
<td>Miller-Meeks spoke at a rally with “racist provocateur and Holocaust denier” Nick Fuentes and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>did not object when Fuentes called for a “monoculture.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Miller-Meeks denounced Fuentes the next day, saying she had not been aware who he was or what he represented, but some felt she had “condemned Fuentes, but not his ideas.”

Fuentes was later involved in the January 6th insurrection and was subpoenaed by the January 6th Select Committee in January 2022 to testify on his role.

January 2021: Miller-Meeks compared violence at the January 6th insurrection to 2020 racial justice protests, the latter of which she falsely claimed Biden had not condemned.

Immediately following the January 6th insurrection, Miller-Meeks had said it was “incumbent” on Trump and Pence to “decry and denounce any violent activities” on the Capitol grounds.

2019: Miller-Meeks said she supported an individual’s 2nd Amendment rights “so that they can support themselves against a government that becomes tyrannical.”

Miller-Meeks Trafficked In “Big Lie” Rhetoric About Her Own Election Results, Claiming She Had Been “Cheated Down” To A Six-Vote Margin, And Gave Conflicting Statements On Whether All Votes Had Been Counted

Miller-Meeks Trafficked In “Big Lie” Rhetoric About Her Own Election Results, Claiming She Had Been “Cheated Down” To A Six-Vote Margin

November 2020: Miller-Meeks Claimed Victory Over Rita Hart While Votes Were Still Being Counted And The Race Was In A Statistical Dead Heat

November 2020: After Pulling Ahead Late On Election Day, Miller-Meeks Declared Victory With A Margin Of 282 Votes, Despite A Possible Recount. “Republican state Sen. Mariannette Miller-Meeks of Ottumwa has declared victory with some votes yet to be counted and a recount possible in a tight race for the Iowa 2nd District congressional seat being vacated by retiring seven-term Democrat Dave Loebsack. With all precincts reporting, Miller-Meeks held a razor-thin 282 vote lead over Democrat Rita Hart out of the nearly 394,000 votes cast in the race. Early voting and a large margin in heavily Democratic Johnson County with nearly 70 percent of the vote gave Hart, a former Democratic state senator from Wheatland, an early lead in the 24-county district that includes Scott, Muscatine, Clinton and Louisa counties. But Miller-Meeks pulled ahead late Tuesday night, leading with 49.95% of the votes cast to Hart's 49.87%, according to unofficial results. The Associated Press had yet to call the race. Hart had led Miller-Meeks with 109,763 votes to Miller-Meeks' 91,068 votes, with 13 of the district's 24 counties counted as of 10:43 p.m.” [Quad-City Times, 11/4/20]

November 2020: Following Election Day, The Contest For Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District Was In Statistical Dead Heat And Remaining Declared As Absentee Ballots Were Being Received. “The victory in a very tight race in Iowa’s Second Congressional District still hasn’t been called. As of 5:00 a.m. Wednesday, with all 24 counties reporting, it’s a statistical dead heat between Republican Mariannette Miller-Meeks and Democrat Rita Hart. It was an even split, percentage-wise between the two, with each taking 50% of the vote but Miller-Meeks currently has the advantage in the vote count with 282 more than Hart. The unofficial vote total from the Iowa Secretary of State’s website does not take into account all mail-in votes and those can still be counted up until next week. As long as the votes were postmarked by midnight on Nov. 2nd and are received by noon on Nov. 9th, they can still be counted.” [WHO Des Moines, 11/4/20]

November 2020: Miller-Meeks Claimed Victory For The Second Time Since Election Day, Despite Even Republican Governor Kim Reynolds Saying She Was “Still Waiting” On Results. “While Republicans like Gov. Kim Reynolds say the country is ‘still waiting’ on the results of last week's presidential election, the Republican candidate in the country's tightest U.S. Congressional race isn't waiting on Iowa officials to declare her
own victory. With all 24 counties' election results certified, the two candidates in Iowa's 2nd Congressional District are currently separately by 47 votes. With her bid just past the post, Republican Mariannette Miller-Meeks claimed victory for the second time since Election Day Tuesday night. 'I express my heartfelt gratitude to the voters of Iowa's 2nd Congressional District and acknowledge my opponent (Democrat) Rita Hart's grace and positive demeanor during this challenging campaign,' Miller-Meeks said in a statement. 'The election is over and it is time to move forward together and focus on the priorities that will best serve Iowans.'” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 11/11/20]

November 2020: Countywide Recounts And Precinct Audits Were Conducted At The Request Of Hart Following Miller-Meeks' Apparent One-Ten-Thousandth Of A Point Lead

Each county will assemble a three-person recount board, with each campaign appointing one individual and then mutually agreeing on the third. Boards will then recount ballots, going precinct by precinct to tabulate each vote again. It's up to the recount board to decide whether to do a machine or hand recount. Only the U.S. House second district race will be recounted. There were 394,383 votes cast in the election. Miller-Meeks has a one-tenthousandth of a point lead. Given the tight margin, Iowa Secretary of State Paul Pate told the Quad-City Times on Tuesday there is the potential the result could change enough to impact the race. […] Errors discovered in Jasper County and Lucas County in the days after election night led changed votes, and leaders. Auditors in both counties said human data-entry errors were to blame. Countywide recounts and precinct audits were ordered in both counties. Jasper and Lucas will have to recount votes again to comply with the Hart campaign request.” [Ottumwa Courier, 11/18/20]

November 2020: Kevin McCarthy Claimed On Fox News That 300 Iowans Had Re-Voted, A Claim That PolitiFact Found “Pants On Fire” False

Kevin McCarthy’s Claim That 300 Iowans Re-Voted, Costing Miller-Meeks Her Lead, Was “Pants On Fire” False. ‘Kevin McCarthy: In Iowa, ‘they have allowed a little over 300 people to re-vote.’ PolitiFact’s ruling: Pants on Fire Here’s why: House Minority Leader Kevin McCarthy, R-California, was talking on conservative commentator Laura Ingraham’s Fox News Channel show, The Ingraham Angle, on Nov. 5 about Republican claims of possible voter fraud when he referred to Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District race. Democratic Party candidate Rita Hart and Republican Party candidate Mariannette Miller-Meeks were in a tight battle for the seat. ‘I don’t have all the facts but I (sic) was just reported that they have allowed a little over 300 people to re-vote and now we’re behind,’ McCarthy said. […] McCarthy said that 300 voters in Iowa were allowed to re-vote to change an election outcome. That is wrong. Pate and Parrott laid out in their news conference how the state first reported votes in Miller-Meeks’ favor swung to being in Hart’s favor. No one was allowed to re-vote, Pate’s office said. And even though McCarthy couched his television statement by saying he didn’t know all the facts, he said it anyway, and Ingraham picked up on it as though it were fact. We rate the claim of 300 Iowans allowed to re-vote as Pants on Fire.” [PolitiFact Texas, Austin American-Statesman, 11/20/20]

November 2020: A State Election Board Certified Miller-Meeks’ Victory By Six Votes

Miller-Meeks’ Victory By Six Votes Was Certified By A State Board In Late November 2020. “A state board certified Iowa Republican Mariannette Miller-Meeks as the representative-elect for Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District Monday in a race that came down to just six votes — the closest federal election in the country this year. Though Democrat Rita Hart is likely to challenge the results in court, the action marks the end of weeks of recounts that showed a steadily narrowing race. Shortly after Monday's board vote, Miller-Meeks thanked her supporters. ‘I will never quit fighting for you and your opportunity at the American Dream!’ she tweeted. ‘Let’s get to work!’ The state Board of Canvass met Monday afternoon in a brief teleconference to certify the results: 196,964 votes for Miller-Meeks to the 196,958 votes cast for Hart.” [Des Moines Register, 11/30/20]
December 2020: Miller-Meeks Told A Local Paper That Every Legal Ballot In her Race Had Been Counted, But Told An Iowa PBS Affiliate That There Were Votes For Her That Had Not Been Counted

Iowa City Press-Citizen: Miller-Meeks Said Every Legal Ballot In Her Race Had Been Counted, But Also Said “There Were Votes That Were Cast That Were For Me Also That Were Not Counted And That I Did Not Receive.” “Miller-Meeks repeatedly told the Press-Citizen in an interview last week that ‘every legal ballot (in the 2nd District race) was counted’ and that Hart was attempting to use a ‘partisan political process’ to change the election’s result. But Miller-Meeks also acknowledged in an interview on PBS’ Iowa Press over the weekend that ‘there were votes that were cast that were for me also that were not counted and that I did not receive.’” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 12/16/20]


December 2020: Rita Hart Filed An Electoral Challenge In The US House Under The Federal Contested Election Act Following What She Called A “Haphazard” Iowa Recount. “Miller-Meeks defeated Hart by just six votes after a bipartisan state canvassing board certified the election results following a district-wide recount in all 24 counties. Hart contends 22 ballots were unlawfully excluded from the certified election results. Hart and her attorneys, too, argue thousands of ballots with recorded under and over votes were not examined for voter intent, due to a ‘haphazard’ recount that was marred by errors, discrepancies and inconsistencies in how ballots were reviewed from county to county. Hart formally filed her challenge with the U.S. House on Dec. 22 under the Federal Contested Election Act. ‘As this provisional seating makes clear, we will not know who won this race until all votes have been counted,’ Hart said in a statement Sunday. ‘It is most important that we get this right and that the candidate who has received the most votes is seated.’” [Quad-City Times, 1/3/21]

• January 2021: Miller-Meeks Said “I Will Not Let Partisan Gamesmanship Stand In My Way To Deliver Results For The People Of Iowa. Now Is The Time To Put The 2020 Election Behind Us.” Allowing Miller-Meeks to take office does not preclude the House from potentially overturning the state's certified election results and later seating Hart pending the outcome of a House review of her election challenge. ‘To those whose support I have yet to earn, I will listen to you, I will fight for you, and I will work to be your representative too,’ Miller-Meeks said in a statement Sunday. ‘I will not let partisan gamesmanship stand in my way to deliver results for the people of Iowa,’ she said. ‘Now is the time to put the 2020 election behind us, unite our country, and work together to tackle the pressing issues that face our country.’” [Quad-City Times, 1/3/21]

March 2021: Rita Hart Withdrew Her Election Challenge And Acknowledged Miller-Meeks’ Victory, After Facing Backlash For A Contentious Case Based On 22 Ballots That Were Allegedly Wrongfully Uncounted

March 2021: Rita Hart Withdrew Her Election Challenge And Acknowledged Miller-Meeks’ Victory. “Rita Hart, the Iowa Democrat who lost a House race by just six votes, is withdrawing her challenge to Republican Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks. In a statement posted to Twitter on Wednesday, the former state senator said she made the decision ‘after many conversations with people I trust about the future of this contest.’ ‘I wish Mariannette Miller-Meeks all the best as she serves the people of this great state as Congresswoman,’ she said. ‘This has been a difficult process for all of those involved and it's incredibly important that we work together to reform the system so this does not happen again in the future.’” [NPR, 3/31/21]

• Miller-Meeks: “I'm Deeply Appreciative That We're Ending This Now.” “I'm deeply appreciative that we're ending this now,’ Ms. Miller-Meeks said in a recorded statement on Wednesday evening. ‘It's time to move forward, to unite as one group of people supporting Iowa's Second Congressional District.’” [New York Times, 3/31/21]

• March 2021: Miller-Meeks Said Hart “Did The Right Thing” In Conceding Rather Than “Drag The
Whole Country Through Another Contentious Process.” “Miller-Meeks, in statement, thanked Hart for ending the challenge. ‘I know how extremely difficult it is to lose an election, but for the people to have faith and confidence in the election system and Iowa laws, it was gracious of her to concede at this time,’ said Miller-Meeks, who has been serving provisionally in the House while the contest continued. ‘I look forward to continuing to work to represent the people of Iowa's Second District.’ Miller-Meeks called the end of the contest ‘a tremendous relief’ as she arrived at a vaccination clinic at the Washington County Department of Public Health. She said Hart ‘did the right thing’ rather than ‘drag the whole country through another contentious process.’” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 3/31/21]

**New York Times: Hart's Campaign Had Identified 22 Ballots That They Believed Were Legally Cast But ‘Wrongfully’ Uncounted By State Election Officials.** “Ms. Hart’s campaign had identified 22 ballots that they believed were legally cast but ‘wrongfully’ uncounted by state election officials during a districtwide recount in the fall. Rather than taking her case to court in Iowa before the election was certified, Ms. Hart opted to wait and appeal the results to the House Administration Committee, invoking a 1960s law. With Democrats in control of the chamber, they would have run the review and had the power to order their own recount and a vote by the full House on whether to unseat Ms. Miller-Meeks in favor of their own candidate, which would have added to their eight-seat majority.” [New York Times, 3/31/21]

CNN: “Miller-Meeks’ Lawyers Warned Monday That Hart's Case Could Damage The Public's Faith In Its Elections.” “Miller-Meeks' lawyers warned Monday that Hart's case could damage the public's faith in its elections if a Democratic-controlled House Administration Committee investigated her case, and a Democratic-controlled House voted to seat a Democrat despite the verdict of the state's election board. They asked in the brief, ‘At what point would the committee be merely searching for a result rather than searching for the will of Iowans?’” [CNN, 3/29/21]

June 2021: Miller-Meeks Claimed Democrats Had Engaged In Disinformation In What She Called A “Brazen Attempt To Overturn A State-Certified Election”

Miller-Meeks Said Democrats Engaged In A “Disinformation Campaign” And “Misinformation Campaign” During The 2020 Recount In Iowa's 2nd Congressional District. “With the Senate poised to vote this week on S. 1, their version of House Speaker Nancy Pelosi's election takeover bill, I am reminded of how the Democrats did everything they could to cast doubt on my own hard-fought election victory and how S. 1 is their effort to take their disinformation campaign about Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District election to the national stage. For those who did not closely follow that 2020 election saga, the most important thing to know is it took my Democratic opponent and Democratic Party leaders like Speaker Pelosi nearly five months to accept that a slim majority of voters in Iowa’s 2nd District duly elected me as their legitimate representative. But by the time they admitted the obvious, the damage of their misinformation campaign was already done.” [Fox News, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks Op-Ed, 6/22/21]

Miller-Meeks Op-Ed: Democrats “Did Everything They Could To Cast Doubt On My Own Hard-Fought Election Victory” In A “Brazen Attempt To Overturn A State-Certified Election.” “With the Senate poised to vote this week on S. 1, their version of House Speaker Nancy Pelosi’s election takeover bill, I am reminded of how the Democrats did everything they could to cast doubt on my own hard-fought election victory and how S. 1 is their effort to take their disinformation campaign about Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District election to the national stage. […] But for Pelosi and her fellow Democrats, their brazen attempt to overturn a state-certified election was always about furthering their ultimate goal—rewriting election laws to guarantee the outcome in their favor forever.” [Fox News, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks Op-Ed, 6/22/21]

June 2021: Miller-Meeks Claimed She “Got Elected By More Than Six Votes” But “Six Is What They Cheated Me Down To”

Miller-Meeks Claimed She “Got Elected By More Than Six Votes” But “Six Is What They Cheated Me Down To.” “Haley headlined a fundraiser Saturday at Crow Valley Golf Club in Davenport for Miller-Meeks, who
won last year's election for Iowa's 2nd district U.S. House seat by six votes, the narrowest victory margin in a House race in almost 40 years, after Democrat Rita Hart ended her 2020 election challenge before the U.S. House in March. ‘I like to say I got elected by more than six votes. Six is what they cheated me down to,’ Miller-Meeks told the crowd of roughly 90 supporters.” [Quad-City Times, 6/26/21]

**Miller-Meeks Later Backtracked And Said She Did Not Think There Was Any Fraud In Her 2020 Election**

July 2021: Miller-Meeks Went Back On Her Previous Statement, Saying “I Don’t Think That There Was Fraud In This Election” And Encouraging Iowans To “Be Confident In Election Integrity”

**Miller-Meeks Said She Did Not Think There Was Fraud In Her 2020 Election After Previously Saying She Was “Cheated Down” To A Six-Vote Margin.** “Miller-Meeks won her race for Iowa’s second district congressional seat by just six votes. In late June told a crowd in Davenport she had been ‘cheated down’ to that margin in the district-wide recount. Last night, Miller-Meeks took issue with how some county auditors handled tabulation errors, but she said Iowans can trust the final certified result. ‘I don’t think that there was fraud in this election,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘I think that Iowans can be confident of election integrity and they can be confident of the process.’” [Radio Iowa, 7/9/21]

**Miller-Meeks Said “There Was Fraud” In The 2020 Presidential Election And Accepted More Than $50,000 In Campaign Contributions From Members Who Objected To The 2020 Electoral College Vote Count**

**Miller-Meeks Said “There Was Fraud” And “There Were Irregularities” In The 2020 Presidential Election And Called For An Investigation, Despite Court Decisions That Found No Evidence**

Miller-Meeks: “There Were Irregularities” In The 2020 Presidential Election And “There Were States That Violated Their Own Legislative Codes. And That's Something That I Think Can Be Looked At And Should Be Looked At.” PRICE: “But did fraud cost him the election or not?” MILLER-MEEKS: “I'd say that there were irregularities and that there were states that violated their own legislative codes. And that's something that I think can be looked at and should be looked at. And I think states should be very proactive in looking at how they can improve their election system.” [YouTube, WHO13, 11/7/21] (VIDEO) 00:06:08

January 2021: When Asked Whether She Regretted Not Doing More To Push Back On Trump's Claims About Election Fraud, Miller-Meeks Said “Every Individual, Whether A Candidate For Office Or Not, Is Personally Responsible For Their Own Comments And Conduct.” “Iowa's Republican congressional and statewide leaders have addressed the topic of election fraud in recent weeks, but to varying degrees of clarity and vagueness. As Trump departs and President-elect Joe Biden is sworn in, The Gazette-Lee Des Moines Bureau asked Iowa Republican for specific responses to the same three questions: whether they acknowledge Biden as the next president; whether they believe the election was free and fair; and whether they regret not doing more to push back at Trump's baseless claims about election fraud. The bureau posed the questions to Iowa's top Republican officials; U.S. Sens. Chuck Grassley and Joni Ernst; U.S. Reps. Ashley Hinson, Mariannette Miller-Meeks and Randy Feenstra; Gov. Kim Reynolds; and state party Chairman Jeff Kaufmann. […] Said Miller-Meeks, 'Every individual, whether a candidate for office or not, is personally responsible for their own comments and conduct. I supported President Trump based on his policies and results for the American people and our country such as cutting taxes and decreasing business regulations. Prior to COVID, those policies created an unparalleled economic boom with expansive job growth and wage increases.’” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 1/18/21]

**Quad-City Times: Miller-Meeks “Insisted ‘There Was Fraud’ In The 2020 Presidential Election, Despite A Series Of Reviews And Court Cases That Found No Evidence Of Widespread Issues.”** “Miller-Meeks in an interview with the Quad-City Times last week, while recognizing Democrat Joe Biden as president-elect and voting
to reject a challenge to Biden's Electoral College victory, insisted ‘there was fraud’ in the 2020 presidential election, despite a series of reviews and court cases that found no evidence of widespread issues. ‘I think in order to listen to people and to heal our nation — to answer those grievances — that there should be either an investigation or a commission to look into that,’ she said. ‘There was fraud. There were irregularities. There were states that did not follow their state law, and/or election officials violated state law. I think all of those things are worthwhile to address so that everyone has faith and confidence and trust in the election system.’” [Quad-City Times, 1/13/21]

Quad-City Times: Miller-Meeks Gave “Credence To The False Claims Of Widespread Voting Irregularities” And Called For An Investigation Into Voter Fraud In The Biden Election. “Miller-Meeks voted Wednesday to reject a challenge to Biden’s Electoral College victory, believing Congress did not have the constitutional authority to overturn state election results. But, on Thursday Miller-Meeks continued to give credence to the false claims of widespread voting irregularities. ‘I think in order to listen to people and to heal our nation — to answer those grievances — that there should be either an investigation or a commission to look into that,’ she said. ‘There was fraud. There were irregularities. There were states that did not follow their state law, and/or election officials violated state law. I think all of those things are worthwhile to address so that everyone has faith and confidence and trust in the election system.’” [Quad-City Times, 1/7/21]

**Miller-Meeks Accepted More Than $50,000 In Campaign Contributions From Members Who Objected To The 2020 Electoral College Vote Count**

October 2021: Miller-Meeks Appeared At Public Events With Trump Where He Falsely Claimed He Was The Rightful President

The Hill: Miller-Meeks Was Among The GOP Lawmakers Who “Appeared Recently With Trump At Public Events Where The Former President Has Riled The Crowd With False Claims That He's The Rightful Commander In Chief.” “Other GOP lawmakers — like Iowa Reps. Mariannette Miller-Meeks and Ashley Hinson — have appeared recently with Trump at public events where the former president has riled the crowd with false claims that he's the rightful commander in chief. Still others are pressing party leaders to make election integrity a central plank of the 2022 platform, even as many in the party are hoping to turn the page and focus on Biden's challenges.” [The Hill, 10/17/21]

CNN: Miller-Meeks “Appeared Alongside Trump As He Continued To Falsely Claim That Biden Did Not Win The White House Legitimately.” “Sen. Chuck Grassley, the longest-serving GOP senator currently in office, and Reps. Ashley Hinson and Mariannette Miller-Meeks, two freshman swing district Republicans who were vocal proponents of certifying the 2020 election results, all appeared alongside Trump as he continued to falsely claim that Biden did not win the White House legitimately.” [CNN, 10/13/21]

December 2020: Miller-Meeks Said Trump “Should Go Through All The Legal Options That Are Available To Him”

Miller-Meeks: “Just As My Opponent Is Going Through All Maneuvers […] I Think The President, President Trump Should Go Through All The Legal Options That Are Available To Him As Well.” “Asked whether Miller-Meeks recognizes Biden's win, Woolson pointed to her comments during a Dec. 4 taping of 'Iowa Press.' Miller-Meeks said Trump was ‘going through the legal process as my opponent is going through, but I think
that all transition services should be available to President-elect Biden, that at this point in time the way that the courts have ruled and the Electoral College votes have gone, President-elect Biden will be assuming office.’ ‘But I do think that just as my opponent is going through all maneuvers, even though they jumped over the Iowa courts, I think the President, President Trump should go through all the legal options that are available to him as well,’ Miller-Meeks said.” [Quad-City Times, 12/16/20]

**Miller-Meeks Said Iowans Could Trust Election Results “Because Of The Election Law Changes We Have Made In Iowa In The Past Three Years,” Including Strict Voter ID Laws And Tighter Absentee Ballot Deadlines**

**November 2021: Miller-Meeks Said Iowans Could Trust Election Results “Because Of The Election Law Changes We Have Made In Iowa In The Past Three Years”**

November 2021: Miller-Meeks: “Because Of The Election Law Changes We Have Made In Iowa In The Past Three Years, People In Iowa Can Trust That Our Elections Are Fair,” MILLER-MEEKS: “But one thing I can say is because of the election law changes we have made in Iowa in the past three years, people in Iowa can trust that our elections are fair, they can have confidence and trust in our process, and that both parties when they talk about either on one party talking about voter suppression if you ask for voter ID, the other party saying--and I think over the weekend I heard Stacey Abrams and Terry McAuliffe running for governor of Virginia talk about the election was stolen from Stacey Abrams in Georgia when she ran for governor--that on both sides, that undermines confidence in our election system. And we need to have trust in, you know, both our election system and institutions of government that are there to help people. In Iowa, I know that we can have trust and confidence in our election system because of the changes we've made over the past three years. Other states are also putting in some election integrity measures and security measures. And those laws have been opposed and denigrated, and I don't think that's helpful for all of us. You know, to me, how do you answer election fraud? If you think there's fraud, the way to answer it, get out to vote, get out to vote in huge numbers. So, people need to turn out to vote, they need to turn out to vote in overwhelming support for the candidate that they choose to support.” [YouTube, WHO13, 11/7/21] (VIDEO) 00:04:47

**Miller-Meeks Said She Supported Iowa’s Tighter Absentee Ballot Deadlines And Voter ID Laws, The Latter Of Which She Called “Highly Supported By The Public”**

Miller-Meeks: Iowans Could “Have Confidence And Trust In Our System Because Of The Election Law Changes That We Made.” “The Republican message was the same in Davenport, where Davis joined 2nd District U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks for a discussion with Iowa state Republican Sens. Roby Smith of Davenport and Chris Cournoyer of LeClaire, lawyer Alan Ostergren and University of Iowa law professor Derek Muller. ‘In Iowa, we know the system worked,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘We know that people can have confidence and trust in our system because of the election law changes that we made.’ They include Iowa’s 2017 voter ID law and ‘codifying identification process on the absentee ballot request.’” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 10/4/21]

Miller-Meeks: “When You Look At What Happens Where There Is Voter ID And People Can Trust The System, More People Vote.” “All of those things have led us to the point where we had the largest turnout in the past election cycle that we’ve had,” Miller-Meeks said. ‘I think when you look at what happens where there is voter ID and people can trust the system, more people vote, and that includes in low-income and minority areas as well.’” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 10/4/21]

Miller-Meeks Said Voter ID Laws Were “Highly Supported By The Public” And That “Iowans Can Have Great Confidence And Trust In Their Election System.” “HOST: A recent Iowa poll showed that 32% of Iowans and almost half of Iowans who voted for Donald Trump say they are not confident that the next election results will be, that they can trust the next election results. So there is obviously an attitude out there about a lack of confidence in our elections that has been building off of this. What will it take to lower those numbers, especially given that every review, legal challenge, etc., non-partisan reviews, has shown that the election was conducted
fairly and legally? What will it take to convince those Americans that these elections can be trusted? MILLER-MEEKS: Well I think one thing that’s not helpful is to have a bill going though Congress that is put forward by the majority party to get rid of voter ID. The election bill that now is, they’re looking at perhaps changing that in the Senate, and concentrating on the election bill rather than on Build Back Better because at this point in time they don’t have the votes to pass that through the Senate. That getting rid of voter ID, which is highly supported by the public, so you have over 70% of the public supports voter ID. We have voter ID here within the state of Iowa, and if you look at our elections here within the state of Iowa I think Iowans can have great confidence and trust in their election system. So we have put through election law changes in order to secure elections and precisely for that reason, so that people have the confidence that their vote counts. And if anything could tell you your vote counts, it would be my election. So I am probably the poster child. But I think what we did with election law changes, the fact that our voter ID was upheld by our Supreme Court, and then we were told for absentee ballot requests that we needed to codify those changes, those changes were codified. I think in Iowa people can have trust and faith in their elections.” [YouTube, Iowa Press, 12/17/21] (VIDEO) 00:10:10 - 00:12:23

- **Miller-Meeks Said That While She Did Not Think Mail-In And Absentee Ballots Needed To Be Eliminated, She Did Support Iowa's Requirement Of Requiring Driver's License Or Voter Identification Numbers.** “HOST: So much of when those complaints or concerns are raised a lot of it is often around mail-in voting, absentee, early voting. Can we still have that system in place and be able to convince people that that is a safe and fair way to conduct elections? Or do you think mail-in voting needs to be constrained if not eliminated? MILLER-MEEKS: I don’t think it needs to be eliminated, I think the process that we have in Iowa where you request a mail-in ballot or you have an absentee ballot request and you request it and then you have your signature and you have either your driver's license number or your voter identification number, that process I think works extremely well in Iowa and it’s well accepted by the public. And then being able to mail in the ballots, and because we have codified what’s expected, people know it’s expected in Iowa. So we know that your ballot has to be postmarked or barcoded, and had to adapt to that. We had to adapt to changes in postal service delivery. But it has to be barcoded or it has to be postmarked by the day before the election.” [YouTube, Iowa Press, 12/17/21] (VIDEO) 00:12:23 – 00:13:54

- **Miller-Meeks: “And If You're Concerned About Election Fraud, The Best Thing To Do Is To Get More People Out To Vote.”** “HOST: A recent Iowa poll showed that 32% of Iowans and almost half of Iowans who voted for Donald Trump say they are not confident that the next election results will be, that they can trust the next election results. So there is obviously an attitude out there about a lack of confidence in our elections that has been building off of this. What will it take to lower those numbers, especially given that every review, legal challenge, etc., non-partisan reviews, has shown that the election was conducted fairly and legally? What will it take to convince those Americans that these elections can be trusted? MILLER-MEEKS: Well I think one thing that’s not helpful is to have a bill going though Congress that is put forward by the majority party to get rid of voter ID. The election bill that now is, they’re looking at perhaps changing that in the Senate, and concentrating on the election bill rather than on Build Back Better because at this point in time they don’t have the votes to pass that through the Senate. […] But I think what we did with election law changes, the fact that our voter ID was upheld by our Supreme Court, and then we were told for absentee ballot requests that we needed to codify those changes, those changes were codified. I think in Iowa people can have trust and faith in their elections. And if you’re concerned about election fraud, the best thing to do is to get more people out to vote. So get out to vote in bigger and greater numbers.” [YouTube, Iowa Press, 12/17/21] (VIDEO) 00:10:10 - 00:12:23

- **Miller-Meeks Said Campaigns Could “Reach Out To Individuals” And Follow Up To Address Concerns Following Iowa’s Adoption Of Requiring Ballots Arrive To The County Auditor’s Office By Election Day.** “HOST: Actually the new law is that it has to be in the county auditor’s office on election day. MILLER-MEEKS: Yeah. So I think those, because this just came in our most recent iteration of election law changes, and there are other states that have that as well. But knowing that I think helps people to know what they have to do, campaigns can reach out to individuals and they can follow up on that and make sure people understand the law. But I don’t think mail-in ballots or absentee ballot requests with a mail-in ballot should be eliminated.” [YouTube, Iowa Press, 12/17/21] (VIDEO) 00:12:23 – 00:13:54
• Miller-Meeks: Iowans Losing Faith In The Voting System “Can Have Confidence And Trust In The Election System Within Iowa” With The Implementation Of “Safeguards” To Prevent Fraud. “HOST: So just before we move on, what would be your message to those, that 32% of Iowans, half of the Iowans who voted for Donald Trump, who don’t have faith in the current system, what would your message be to them? MILLER-MEEKS: My message would be that they can have confidence and trust in the election system within Iowa. We have put safeguards in place to both prevent fraud, even though it’s usually extremely low and is very difficult to prove, and that if they’re concerned about fraud, get more people out to vote.” [YouTube, Iowa Press, 12/17/21] (VIDEO) 00:13:54 - 00:14:20

January 2021: Miller-Meeks Said She Supported Republican Proposals For A “Federal Baseline” For Vote-By-Mail And The Possibility Of Nationally Adopting Voter ID Laws

January 2021: Miller-Meeks Said That Without “A Federal Baseline” For Absentee Ballots And Signature Verification, “There Will Still Be Suspicion That It Was An Election That Had Irregularities.” “Miller-Meeks called for ‘a federal baseline’ for absentee ballots cast by mail and signature verification. ‘It has to be looked into,’ she said of how some states conducted elections during a pandemic. ‘And, if we don't do that, then there will still be suspicion that it was an election that had irregularities.’ At the same time, Miller-Meeks is objecting to a challenge filed by Democrat Rita Hart with the U.S. House contesting the election results in southeast Iowa's 2nd Congressional District, which includes Scott, Clinton and Muscatine counties.” [Quad-City Times, 1/7/21]

December 2020: Miller-Meeks Signed A Letter Calling For A House Investigation Into “Voting Irregularities,” Which She Said Was In Error, Then Refused To Offer A Stance On The Effort

December 2020: Miller-Meeks Signed A Letter Calling For A House Investigation Into “Voting Irregularities.” “Under your leadership over the past several years, the House has demonstrated a zest for all sorts of investigations, and we believe that you have the strong capacity to initiate a thorough investigation into these voting irregularities,” the signed letter to House Speaker Nancy Pelosi, D-California, reads. When it was first posted Tuesday night, the letter initially included Marianne Miller-Meeks as its 24th signature, but Miller-Meeks' campaign said Wednesday morning that they'd never agreed to sign onto it. When asked Wednesday whether Miller-Meeks supports the investigation, Eric Woolson, the campaign's spokesperson, repeated that she hadn't signed the letter but declined to comment on Miller-Meeks' stance on the investigation.” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 12/16/20]

• Miller-Meeks’ Campaign Said Her Signing Onto A Letter Calling For A House Investigation Into Irregularities In The 2020 Election Was “An Error By The Office Of Rep. Cammack.” “Republican Congresswoman-elect Mariannette Miller-Meeks' campaign said she was mistakenly added to a letter signed by 25 other Republican representatives-elect calling on the U.S. House to investigate irregularities in the 2020 presidential election. Miller-Meeks campaign on Wednesday said she did not sign and did not agree to be included on the letter sent to U.S. House Speaker Nancy Pelosi, D-Calif., asking Congress to ‘thoroughly investigate’ unsubstantiated claims of voter fraud. U.S. Rep.-elect Kat Cammack, R-Fla., who led the letter, sent out a corrected version Wednesday morning that removed Miller-Meeks' name. ‘She didn't agree to sign on to that. That was an error by the office of Rep. Cammack,' Miller-Meeks campaign spokesman Eric Woolson said. Asked whether Miller-Meeks supports her Republican colleagues' push, Woolson said, ‘she didn't sign the letter so I think that speaks for itself.’” [Quad-City Times, 12/16/20]

• Despite Claiming Her Signature Had Been An Error, Miller-Meeks’ Campaign Refused To Clarify Whether She Supported The Effort, Despite Being Asked “Maybe Five Times.” “The campaign will not clarify whether @millermeeks supports her Republican colleague's push. I asked the question to Eric Woolson, spox for the @millermeeks, maybe five times. He just repeated that she didn't sign the letter.” [Twitter, @ZacharyOS, 12/16/20]
Miller-Meeks Made Contradictory Statements About Federal Control Of Elections

March 2021: Miller-Meeks Said “States Should Have Control Over Their Elections, Not The Federal Government” When It Came Time To Vote On The For The People Act…

March 2021: Miller-Meeks Said “States Should Have Control Over Their Elections, Not The Federal Government” And The For The People Act Benefitted “Politicians, Not People.” “Today, March 3rd, 2021, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02) released the following statement after voting NO on H.R 1: ‘The inaccurately titled ‘For the People Act’ does not benefit or help ‘the people’. This legislation would create a campaign donation matching scheme in which every single dollar of campaign donations would be matched by six dollars from the taxpayer. Using public dollars to fund election campaigns and political ads is unacceptable to most Americans, including myself. H.R. 1 should be named after those it really benefits, politicians, not people. I believe that states should have control over their elections, not the federal government. H.R. 1 would even nullify Iowa’s voter ID laws that were found to be constitutional. As an Iowa State Senator, I voted for and supported legislation to give Iowans faith and confidence in their election system. H.R. 1 would undermine state election laws and voter’s trust in their elections, and I cannot support it.” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 3/3/21]

…Two Months After She Said She Supported Republican Proposals For A “Federal Baseline” For Vote-By-Mail And The Possibility Of Nationally Adopting Voter ID Laws…

January 2021: Miller-Meeks Said She Supported Republican Measures That Provide A Federal Baseline To Ballots Cast By Mail And Signature Verification, And The Consideration Of National Adoption Of Voter ID Laws Like Iowa’s. “Miller-Meeks in her statement said she respects ‘that my patriotic colleagues’ actions are principled and based on their interpretation of the Constitution, knowing that it would not change the outcome of the presidential election. And it is for that reason that we desperately need intensive oversight into election irregularities.’ Miller-Meeks said she supports Republican measures that provide a federal baseline to ballots cast by mail and signature verification, and that state adoption of voter ID laws like Iowa’s ‘merits consideration and debate.’ ‘I understand this decision will disappoint and anger my supporters, but I have sworn an oath to support and defend the Constitution above myself,’ Miller-Meeks said.” [Quad-City Times, 1/5/21]

…Despite Promising State Control Over Elections On The Campaign Trail In 2020

Miller-Meeks Said She Would Combat Voter Fraud With Mail-In Voting By Making Sure States Have Control Over Elections While Speaking At A Republican Candidate Forum. At a Johnson County GOP Candidate Forum Miller-Meeks was asked “How would you combat voter fraud with mail-in voting?” Miller-Meeks said “It’s interesting because in the CARES Act, the Democrats and Nancy Pelosi were trying to put in provisions about voting by mail. And so I think it’s very important that we be mindful. Constitutionally elections are the province of the state. So we need to make sure that states have domain over elections and that they’re state run. We in Iowa are fortunate to have a voter ID law that was stood up by our Supreme Court, so we know that our Voter ID law is constitutional. And over the past two years we have worked very hard in the legislature to try to reduce the early voting time. They did get that reduced.” [Johnson County GOP Candidate Forum, 00:04:23:34, 4/24/20] (VIDÉO)

Miller-Meeks Sided With The Rioters Who Assaulted Police At The Capitol On January 6, Voting Against A Select Committee To Investigate The Attack And Sympathizing With Those Awaiting Trial

Miller-Meeks Said There Was “Plenty Of Blame To Go Around To All Of Us” Surrounding The January 6th Insurrection
In Response To The January 6th Insurrection, Miller-Meeks Said “I Think There Is Plenty Of Blame To Go Around To All Of Us,” Criticized Democrats, And Defended Trump’s Comments

Miller-Meeks: Trump’s Comments About The January 6 Insurrection “Did Not Rise To The Level Of Inciting Violence” And Counted As “Protected Free Speech.” “Republican U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks defended her support of an independent commission examining the Jan. 6 Capitol riot during a meeting with area conservatives Wednesday. […] But Miller-Meeks pushed back, saying she thought the effort actually could have benefited the former president, whom Democrats have said incited the chaos. ‘I think it’s important to establish the timeline,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘And the timeline is something that could help President Trump. I did not vote to impeach President Trump, because constitutionally I felt that he had protected free speech under the Constitution. It did not rise to the level of inciting violence.’” [Des Moines Register, 6/9/21]

Miller-Meeks: Some Of The “Failures In Leadership” That Led To The January 6th Insurrection “May Rest At The Feet Of Democrats.” “Asked how voters in Iowa's 2nd District will react to her vote, especially Republican voters in Scott County, where the former county GOP chairman was forced to step down after criticizing Trump's comments leading up to the violent Jan. 6 insurrection on the U.S. Capitol, Miller-Meeks said she is willing to defend her decision and ‘conservative voting record on the issues that are important to Republican voters. ‘I think that most Republicans, had they seen the Capitol police as I had seen them and the violence that ensued,’ (in which rioters brutally beat police, broke in through windows and doors and hunted for lawmakers as they fled), ‘would also want to get to the bottom of this,’ she said. ‘We need to know where there were failures in leadership. And some of those failures ... may rest at the feet of Democrats. And so I think it’s very important to have those questions answered.’” [Quad-City Times, 5/20/21]

Quad-City Times: Letter To The Editor: Miller-Meeks’ “Particularly Disturbing” Response To The January 6th Insurrection Should Have Been “A Whole Lot More Forceful.” “We are all affected when domestic terrorists stage a deadly coup on our democracy. We do not all react the same. The response of U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks seems particularly disturbing. Her televised remarks last week included these words: ‘We’d strongly encourage people to disperse and to peacefully protest in another part of the capitol...’ When our capitol building has been breached, the safety of our entire Congress placed in jeopardy, and our democratic form of government assaulted while in session, I expect, no demand, that anyone representing me in Washington be a whole lot more forceful than, ‘Now boys, just be nice and go play somewhere else.’ ‘Strongly encourage’ should have been ‘demand’. ‘People’ should read ‘terrorists’; ‘peacefully protest’ should be labeled what it is, ‘an act of insurrection’. And what of ‘another part of the capitol’ — the Supreme Court, the vice-president’s home, the treasury….? How about ‘jail’?” [Quad-City Times, Letter to the Editor, 1/16/21]

January 2021: In Response To The January 6th Insurrection, Miller-Meeks Said “I Think There Is Plenty Of Blame To Go Around To All Of Us.” “While continuing to condemn the mob violence that gripped the U.S. Capitol Wednesday, freshman Iowa Republican U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks on Thursday suggested President Trump and congressional Republicans should not be held accountable for stoking the violence. And while recognizing Democrat Joe Biden as president-elect, Miller-Meeks insisted ‘there was fraud’ in the 2020 presidential election, despite a series of reviews and court cases that found no evidence of widespread issues. ‘I think there is plenty of blame to go around to all of us,’ Miller-Meeks told the Quad-City Times of the ‘feeling of helplessness and powerlessness and hopelessness’ Americans feel, fueled by a pandemic, racial turmoil and a contested presidential election, that has led to unrest across the nation.” [Quad-City Times, 1/7/21]

HEADLINE: Quad-City Times: “Miller-Meeks: Trump Should Stay And 'Plenty Of Blame To Go Around' For US Capitol Riot.” [Quad-City Times, 1/7/21]

January 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Objecting To The Counting Of 2020 Electoral Votes From Key States, But Praised Her “Patriotic” Colleagues Who Voted To Overturn The Election Results
Miller-Meeks Voted Against Objecting To The Counting Of 2020 Electoral Votes From Pennsylvania. In January 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against the “Rep. Perry, R-Pa., and Sen. Hawley, R-Mo., objection to the counting of electoral votes from the state of Pennsylvania during the joint session of Congress, on the grounds that they were not, under all of the known circumstances, regularly given.” The objection was rejected, 138-282. [House Vote #11, 1/7/21; CQ. 1/7/21]

Miller-Meeks Voted Against Objecting To The Counting Of 2020 Electoral Votes From Arizona. In January 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against the “Rep. Gosar, R-Ariz., and Sen. Cruz, R-Texas, objection to the counting of electoral votes from the state of Arizona during the joint session of Congress, on the grounds that they were not, under all of the known circumstances, regularly given.” The objection was rejected, 121-303. [House Vote #10, 1/6/21; CQ. 1/6/21]

Miller-Meeks Voted Against Tabling The Motion To Refer The House Rules Package To A Select Committee That Would Add Provisions Changing Federal Election Administration. In January 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against a “Hoyer, D-Md., motion to table (kill) the Davis, R-Ill., motion to refer the resolution to a select committee composed of the majority and minority leaders with instructions to report it back to the House with an amendment that would require the House Administration Committee to report to the House no later than Jan. 31, 2021, a bill related to federal election administration. It would require the bill to state that states have ‘primary authority’ to conduct elections and that Congress’ ‘proper role’ is to provide support to states and ‘ensure fair administration of’ and voter confidence in’ the administration of federal elections. It would also require the bill to include provisions that would extend federal baseline standards for ballot signature verification, ‘promote certainty’ in election results and provide for oversight of the use of federal funds to administer federal elections.” The motion was agreed to, 214-196. [H. Res. 8, Vote #5, 1/4/21; CQ. 1/4/21]

- **Roll Call: The Motion, A “GOP Delay Tactic,” Would Have Stated The States Held “Primary Authority To Conduct Elections For Federal Office” And Congress’ Role Was “Secondary.”** “Republicans then offered a motion that would have added language on election oversight and administration that acknowledges ‘the primary authority to conduct elections for federal office is reserved to the states and that the Congress’s role is secondary’ but establishes federal oversight standards for mail-in ballots. Hoyer also moved to table that motion, which was agreed to, 214-196. ‘It’s disappointing House Democrats have completely dismissed the first opportunity to work together in the new Congress to instill voter confidence and protect the integrity of our election process,’ said House Administration ranking member Rodney Davis of Illinois, the Republican who offered the original motion. After more than two hours of GOP delay tactics that Democrats rejected, the floor debate began.” [Roll Call, 1/4/21]

**US News:** Miller-Meeks Was “Among The Minority Of House Republicans Who Voted Against Trump’s Groundless Effort To Invalidate Electoral College Votes” Hours After The January 6th Insurrection. “‘For Democrats to somehow change their tune in a matter of weeks over how sacrosanct an election certificate is is the height of hypocrisy,’ said Illinois Rep. Rodney Davis, top Republican on the House Administration panel. Davis and Miller-Meeks were among the minority of House Republicans who voted against Trump’s groundless effort to invalidate Electoral College votes won by now-President Joe Biden. Those roll calls occurred hours after Trump supporters’ tried disrupting that process with the Jan. 6 attack on the Capitol, which left five people dead.” [US News & World Report, 3/24/21]

**Miller-Meeks Had Previously Said “I Have Suspicions About The Integrity Of The Votes Cast In Several States” In Her Statement Released On The Scheduled Vote To Certify**

Miller-Meeks: “I Have Suspicions About The Integrity Of The Votes Cast In Several States.” “Today, January 6th, 2021, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02) issued the following statement regarding the scheduled vote to certify the electoral votes of the 2020 presidential election: ‘Along with many Iowans, I have serious concerns about how elections were conducted in some states and outraged at abuses of the election systems in those states. Such abuses undermine election integrity and trust in the system of that state, and more broadly those actions have affected the presidential election. I share the disappointment of millions of Iowans and Americans with the outcome...”
of the presidential election results. I have suspicions about the integrity of the votes cast in several states, the mass mailing of ballots to every name on the voter rolls which are not up-to-date, the allegations of a lack of a chain of custody of their election materials, and the actions of elections boards and courts assuming authority beyond what is granted to them in a state’s constitution or by their legislatures.” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 1/6/21]

Miller-Meeks Said She Knew Her Decision To Certify The Electoral College Count Would “Disappoint And Anger My Supporters” And She Respected Her “Patriotic” Colleagues Who Voted Against Certification

Miller-Meeks Said That While She Would Vote To Accept The State-Certified Electors, She Respected “That My Patriotic Colleagues’ Actions Are Principled And Based On Their Interpretation Of The Constitution.” “I respect that my patriotic colleagues’ actions are principled and based on their interpretation of the Constitution, knowing that it would not change the outcome of the presidential election. And it is for that reason that we desperately need intensive oversight into election irregularities. As Republicans, we voted on measures such as providing a federal baseline to ballots cast by mail, signature verification, and the reaffirmation that states have the primary role to run elections, supporting both the concept of federalism and the Electoral College. Adoption of voter ID, which we have passed and secured in Iowa, both on election day and on absentee ballot request forms, also merits consideration and debate. To me the text of the Constitution is clear: states select electors, Congress does not. As a Member of Congress who wants to limit the power of the federal government, I must respect the states’ authority here. I understand this decision will disappoint and anger my supporters, but I have sworn an oath to support and defend the Constitution above myself. Therefore, I will vote to accept the state-certified electors.” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 1/6/21]

Miller-Meeks Said She Knew The Decision To Certify The Electoral College Count Would “Disappoint And Anger My Supporters.” “Miller-Meeks in her statement said she respects ‘that my patriotic colleagues’ actions are principled and based on their interpretation of the Constitution, knowing that it would not change the outcome of the presidential election. And it is for that reason that we desperately need intensive oversight into election irregularities.’ Miller-Meeks said she supports Republican measures that provide a federal baseline to ballots cast by mail and signature verification, and that state adoption of voter ID laws like Iowa’s ‘merits consideration and debate.’ ‘I understand this decision will disappoint and anger my supporters, but I have sworn an oath to support and defend the Constitution above myself,’ Miller-Meeks said.” [Quad-City Times, 1/5/21]

2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Establishing A Select Committee To Investigate The January 6th Attack Following The Failure To Establish A Bipartisan Commission

June 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Establishment Of The Select Committee To Investigate The January 6 Attack On The US Capitol. In June 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against: “Agreeing to the resolution that would establish a special committee in the House of Representatives to investigate facts and causes related to the Jan. 6, 2021, ‘domestic terrorist attack’ on the U.S. Capitol; examine and evaluate evidence developed by relevant federal, state and local governmental agencies; and build upon the investigations of other entities. It would require the committee to investigate facts and circumstances of the attack related to intelligence and law enforcement agency activities and factors contributing to the attack, including online platforms and foreign influence operations; identify and analyze the causes of and lessons learned from the attack with regard to law enforcement operations and security protocol at the Capitol; and submit to Congress reports including findings and conclusions of its investigations, legislative recommendations, and recommendations for corrective measures. The resolution would authorize the speaker of the House to appoint 13 members to the committee, including five members after consultation with the minority leader. Among other provisions, it would authorize the committee chair to issue subpoenas, authorize such sums as may be necessary for committee expenses, and specify that the committee would terminate 30 days after filing its final report to Congress.” The bill passed 222 to 190. [H. Res. 503, Vote #197, 6/30/21; CQ, 6/30/21]
• The Select Committee Was Established After Senate Republicans Blocked A Vote On Creating A Bipartisan Outside Commission To Investigate The January 6th Insurrection. “In a largely party-line vote, the Democratic-controlled House of Representatives approved legislation on Wednesday to create a select committee to launch a new inquiry into the Jan. 6 attack on the U.S. Capitol. With a larger share of Republicans voting against the plan, it marks the latest turn in a partisan fight to investigate the riot […] Last month, Senate Republicans blocked a move to vote on an outside commission, leaving Democratic leaders with plans to move forward with a House select committee instead. But some Republicans who supported the independent commission voted against the select committee.” [NPR, 6/30/21]

• Miller-Meeks And The Other Two Iowa Republican Representatives Voted Against Establishing A Select Committee To Investigate The January 6th Insurrection. “The U.S. House voted Wednesday to establish a select committee to investigate the Jan. 6 insurrection, in which a mob of pro-Trump supporters attacked the U.S. Capitol. In a 222-190 vote that was almost entirely party-line, just two Republicans joined Democrats in passing the resolution, which calls for a probe into ‘one of the darkest days of our democracy.’ The two were Reps. Liz Cheney of Wyoming and Adam Kinzinger of Illinois. Nineteen Republicans did not vote. Iowa’s three Republican representatives, Randy Feenstra, Ashley Hinson, and Mariannette Miller-Meeks, voted against the resolution. Democratic Rep. Cindy Axne voted for it.” [Iowa Capital Dispatch, 6/30/21]

Miller-Meeks Said That A January 6th Select Committee Would Be “Another Partisan, Political Hack Job” And Compared It To The House Investigation Of Russian Election Interference

Miller-Meeks Said She Was Worried The Select Committee To Investigate The January 6 Insurrection Would “Become Another Political Partisan Exercise Such As We Saw With The Russian Collusion Hoax.” “U.S. Representative for Iowa’s 2nd District Mariannette Miller-Meeks was one of 35 House Republicans that voted in favor of that legislation. She shares her thoughts on Pelosi’s plans to further investigate the Capitol attack that resulted in six deaths, ‘I’ve always believed that we must get to the bottom of what happened that day and that having a more neutral bipartisan commission with equal representation would have ensured that it was not a political partisan process. So with the creation of a select committee I’m worried that it will become another political partisan exercise such as we saw with the Russian collusion hoax.’” [KCII, 6/29/21]

Miller-Meeks Said She Would Not Vote For A Select Committee To Investigate The January 6th Insurrection Because It Was Going To Be “Another Partisan, Political Hack Job.” “I was very concerned if this commission, with equal representation (from both parties) … and an end date, did not go through that (House Speaker) Nancy Pelosi would set up her own commission and it would be another partisan, political hack job. I was right.’ Pelosi announced this week she will create a select committee to investigate the Jan. 6 attack on the Capitol after Republicans blocked the formation of an independent commission. Miller-Meeks said she will not vote for Pelosi's commission.” [Quad-City Times, 6/26/21]

July 2021: Iowa Public Radio Called Miller-Meeks’ Vote Against The Select Committee “An About-Face” Given That She Had Supported The Initial Bipartisan Commission

Iowa Public Radio: Voting Against The January 6th Select Committee Was “An About-Face By Miller-Meeks.” “Outside of sole Democratic member U.S. Rep. Cindy Axne, Iowa's Congressional delegation has not supported this new select committee to investigate the January 6 riot. U.S. Representatives Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Ashley Hinson and Randy Feenstra — Iowa’s Republican delegation to the House — voted with their party leaders against creating the committee. This was an about-face by Miller-Meeks, who voted in favor of the initial bipartisan commission blocked by her Republican colleagues in the Senate like Chuck Grassley and Joni Ernst.” [Iowa Public Radio, 7/29/21]

• Miller-Meeks Had Voted To Establish A Bipartisan Commission To Investigate The January 6th Attack On The U.S. Capitol In May 2021. “One of the three Iowa Republicans serving in the U.S. House voted for establishing a commission to investigate the January 6 attack on the U.S. Capitol. Second District
Congresswoman Mariannette Miller-Meeks of Ottumwa was one of 35 Republicans in the House who voted for creation of a bipartisan commission to examine the events of January 6th. Miller-Meeks has not issued a statement about her vote.” [Radio Iowa, 5/20/21]

July 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted For A Procedural Motion In Support Of Condemning Pelosi’s Decision Not To Seat McCarthy’s Nominations For The Select Committee

Miller-Meeks Voted Against A Motion To Table A Privileged Resolution To Condemn The Refusal Of Speaker Pelosi To Seat All Five Republican Members Nominated By Minority Leader McCarthy To The Jan. 6 Select Committee. In February 2015, Miller-Meeks voted against: “Hoyer, D-Md., motion to table (kill) the privileged resolution that would condemn the refusal of Speaker Pelosi, D-Calif., to seat all five Republican members nominated by Minority Leader McCarthy, R-Calif., to the Jan. 6 select committee and urge Pelosi to appoint the following members: Reps. Banks, R-Ind., Jordan, R-Ohio., Davis, R-III., Armstrong, R-N.D., and Nehls, R-Texas.” The motion was agreed to by a vote of 218-197. [H Res 554, Vote #219, 7/26/21; CQ, 7/26/21]

2021: Miller-Meeks Voted For Establishing A Bipartisan Commission To Investigate The January 6th Attack On The US Capitol

May 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted For A Bill Establishing A Bipartisan Commission To Investigate The January 6th Attack On The US Capitol. In May 2021, Miller-Meeks voted for: “Passage of the bill that would establish a national commission to investigate facts and causes related to the Jan. 6, 2021, "domestic terrorist attack" on the U.S. Capitol; examine and evaluate evidence developed by relevant federal, state and local governmental agencies; and build upon the investigations of other entities. It would require the commission to investigate facts and circumstances of the attack related to intelligence and law enforcement agency activities and factors contributing to the attack, including online platforms and foreign influence operations; identify and analyze the causes of and lessons learned from the attack with regard to law enforcement operations and security protocol at the Capitol; and submit to the president and Congress reports containing findings and recommendations for corrective measures that are agreed to by a majority of the commission. The commission would be composed of ten members, evenly chosen by the majority and minority parties, who have national recognition and significant experience in at least two subject areas related to the attack, such as law enforcement, intelligence, law, civil rights and counterterrorism. Among other provisions, the bill would authorize the commission to issue subpoenas and hold hearings and specify that the commission would submit its final report by the end of 2021 and terminate 60 days after submitting the report.” The bill passed 252-175. [H R 3233, Vote #154, 5/19/21; CQ, 5/19/21]

- Miller-Meeks Was The Only Iowa House Republican To Vote To Establish A Bipartisan Commission To Investigate The January 6th Attack On The U.S. Capitol. “One of the three Iowa Republicans serving in the U.S. House voted for establishing a commission to investigate the January 6 attack on the U.S. Capitol. Second District Congresswoman Mariannette Miller-Meeks of Ottumwa was one of 35 Republicans in the House who voted for creation of a bipartisan commission to examine the events of January 6th. Miller-Meeks has not issued a statement about her vote.” [Radio Iowa, 5/20/21]

Miller-Meeks Said Her Vote To Establish An Independent Commission Was A Vote To Support The Capitol Police And That The Commission “Could Help President Trump” Despite Trump’s Public Criticism

Miller-Meeks Said That When She Voted For The Independent Commission She Was “Supporting The Rank-And-File Capitol Police.” “Miller-Meeks said she was called a ‘traitor’ and a ‘RINO (Republican In Name Only)’ by ‘a small portion of individuals’ for joining Democrats and 34 other Republican House members to back legislation to create an independent, bipartisan commission to investigate the Jan. 6 attack on the U.S. Capitol. ‘I was supporting the rank-and-file Capitol Police,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘Mostly, I wanted to know why there was a breach of security, and at whose level? Because, we’ve never been able to ask questions of all of those individuals in leadership who were terminated or forced to resign immediately.’ Miller-Meeks said she felt it was the ‘rational, pragmatic thing to do.’ ‘I was very concerned if this commission, with equal representation (from both parties) ...
and an end date, did not go through that (House Speaker) Nancy Pelosi would set up her own commission and it would be another partisan, political hack job. I was right.”” [Quad-City Times, 6/26/21]

**Miller-Meeks Said The January 6th Commission Was “Something That Could Help President Trump.”**

“Republican U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks defended her support of an independent commission examining the Jan. 6 Capitol riot during a meeting with area conservatives Wednesday. […] But Miller-Meeks pushed back, saying she thought the effort actually could have benefited the former president, whom Democrats have said incited the chaos. ‘I think it’s important to establish the timeline,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘And the timeline is something that could help President Trump. I did not vote to impeach President Trump, because constitutionally I felt that he had protected free speech under the Constitution. It did not rise to the level of inciting violence.’” [Des Moines Register, 6/9/21]

**Miller-Meeks Said She Voted For The Commission To Have “A More Fair, Bipartisan Process” With “The Ability To Have Subpoena Power.”**

‘Miller-Meeks told the Quad-City Times in an interview Thursday ‘we need to make sure something like this never happens again.’ ‘There is a great amount of concern of the security breach and the lack of security’ at the Capitol, Miller-Meeks said. ‘A lot of blame has been laid at the feet of Capitol police, and I felt that in order to support the Capitol police, a bipartisan commission … having the ability to have subpoena power was important.’ Miller-Meeks added while investigations into the Jan. 6 attack are underway by congressional committees with Democratic majorities, ‘I thought a more fair, bipartisan process where there is equal representation would be important.’”’ [Daily Nonpareil, 5/21/21]


“Former President Donald Trump on Thursday blasted the 35 House Republicans that voted in favor of establishing a commission to investigate the Jan. 6 siege on the Capitol, suggesting it would cost them support from his base. […] GOP Reps. French Hill (Ark.), Steve Womack (Ark.) David Valadao (Calif.) Carlos Gimenez (Fla.), Maria Salazar (Fla.), Mike Simpson (Idaho) Rodney Davis (Ill.), Kinzinger (Ill.), Trey Hollingsworth (Ind.), Mariannette Miller-Meeks (Iowa) Peter Meijer (Mich.), Fred Upton (Mich.), Michael Guest (Miss.), Jeff Fortenberry (Neb.), Don Bacon (Neb.), Chris Smith (N.J.), Andrew Garbarino (N.Y.), Tom Reed (N.Y.), Katko, Chris Jacobs (N.Y.), Dave Joyce (Ohio), Anthony Gonzalez (Ohio), Stephanie Bice (Okla.), Cliff Bentz (Ore.), Brian Fitzpatrick (Pa.), Tom Rice (S.C.), Dusty Johnson (S.D.), Van Taylor (Texas), Tony Gonzales (Texas), Blake Moore (Utah), John Curtis (Utah), Jaime Herrera Beutler (Wash.), Dan Newhouse (Wash.), David McKinley (W.V.) and Cheney voted in favor of the bill.” [New York Post, 5/20/21]

### 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted To Award Congressional Gold Medals To US Capitol Police Officers Who Defended The Capitol During The Insurrection, But Voted Against Funding Security Upgrades For Prevention Of Similar Incidents In The Future

May 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against A Bill Funding Emergency And Security Activities In Response To Jan. 6 Attack On U.S. Capitol And Security Upgrades For Future Prevention Of Similar Incidents. In May 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against: “Passage of the bill that would provide approximately $1.9 billion in emergency supplemental fiscal 2021 appropriations to legislative branch and other federal entities for security activities in response to the Jan. 6, 2021, attack on the U.S. Capitol, including approximately $753 million to reimburse costs associated with responding to the attack and approximately $990 million for legislative and judicial branch security upgrades. Within the total, it would also provide approximately $170 million for legislative branch costs associated with the COVID-19 public health emergency. For expenses related to the Jan. 6 attack and to prevent similar incidents, it would provide $520.9 million to the National Guard and funding for several law enforcement agencies, including the FBI and National Park Service. It would provide $66.8 million to the District of Columbia for public safety expenses related to terrorist threats and federal presence in the district. It would provide $79.3 million for the Capitol Police, including specified funding for employee hazard pay and retention bonuses, the employee wellness program, agreements with state and local law enforcement agencies, protective details for members of Congress, and physical protection barriers.” The bill passed 213 to 212. [H R 3237, Vote #156, 5/20/21; CQ, 5/20/21]
June 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted For Awarding Four Congressional Gold Medals To The US Capitol Police Who Protected The Capitol On January 6th, 2021. In June 2021, Miller-Meeks voted for: “Waters, D-Calif., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended, that would provide for the presentation of four congressional gold medals to the U.S. Capitol Police and those who protected the U.S. Capitol on Jan. 6, 2021. It would require the presentation of one medal each for display at the U.S. Capitol Police headquarters, D.C. Metropolitan Police Department headquarters, Smithsonian Institution and U.S. Capitol.” The motion passed 406 to 21. [H R 3325, Vote #161, 6/15/21; CQ, 6/15/21]

March 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted For Awarding Three Congressional Gold Medals To The United States Capitol Police And Those Who Protected The US Capitol On January 6, 2021. In March 2021, Miller-Meeks voted for: “Waters, D-Calif., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended, that would award three congressional gold medals to the U.S. Capitol Police and those who protected the U.S. Capitol on Jan. 6, 2021. It would require the presentation of one medal each to the U.S. Capitol Police and the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia for display at their headquarters, and one medal to the Smithsonian Institution for display and research, along with a plaque listing the other law enforcement agencies that participated in protecting the Capitol.” The motion passed 413-12. [H Res 1085, Vote #87, 3/17/21; CQ, 3/17/21]


Miller-Meeks On Frustration About January 6th Insurrectionists Awaiting Their Time In Court: “I Understand The Anger” And “We Will Have A More Fair Investigation When We Have Power.” “Miller-Meeks also spoke about the Jan. 6 Commission and said she understood the frustration expressed at the meeting about those who were charged with a federal crime and are still awaiting their time in court. ‘I understand the anger,’ she said. ‘It is a quiet rage and we will have a solution, we will continue to push it and we will continue to investigate it. And we will have a more fair investigation when we have power.’ She urged attendees to, in a respectful manner, continue to ask questions.” [Fort Madison Daily Democrat, 1/5/22]

December 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Finding Trump’s Chief Of Staff Mark Meadows In Contempt Of Congress Following His Refusal To Comply With A Subpoena

December 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Finding Former Trump Chief Of Staff Mark Meadows In Contempt Of Congress For Refusal To Comply With A Subpoena From The January 6th Select Committee. On December 14, 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against “Agreeing to the resolution, that would find Mark Meadows, former White House chief of staff to President Donald Trump, in contempt of Congress for refusal to comply with a subpoena issued by the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol. It would direct the speaker of the House to ‘take all appropriate action to enforce the subpoena’ and certify the committee report (H Rept 117-216) accompanying the contempt resolution to the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia for judicial action.” The motion passed by a vote of 222-208. [H. Res. 851, Vote 447, 12/14/21; CQ, 12/14/21]

- Mark Meadows Provided Thousands Of Documents To The January 6th Committee But Claimed Executive Privilege And Refused To Appear Before The Panel. “Sweeping claims of executive privilege by Meadows and Trump to shield their activities on and before Jan. 6 from congressional scrutiny have been challenged in the court and by constitutional experts. Last week, Meadows backed away from cooperating with the panel just days after saying he would. He argued that the panel was pressuring him to discuss issues that the former president said are protected by executive privilege. However, Meadows had already produced thousands
of documents for the panel, including text messages and emails related to the events of the day.” [Washington Post, 12/15/21]

- **January 6th Committee Chairman Bennie Thompson: The Report Referring Meadows For Criminal Contempt Was “Clear And Compelling.”** “The select committee's report referring Mr. Meadows for criminal contempt charges is clear and compelling,” Committee Chairman Bennie Thompson, a Democrat from Mississippi, said on Tuesday. ‘As White House chief of staff, Mr. Meadows played a role in or was witness to key events leading up to and including the January 6th assault on the United States Capitol.’ […] Republican Rep. Liz Cheney of Wyoming, the vice chair of the select committee, said Tuesday that Meadows had received numerous text messages urging Trump to take action to stop the riot that he has produced without any privilege claim.” [CNN, 12/21/21]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>October 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Finding Steve Bannon In Contempt Of Congress For Refusal To Comply With A Subpoena From The January 6th Select Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Finding Steve Bannon In Contempt Of Congress For Refusal To Comply With A Subpoena From The January 6th Select Committee. On October 21, 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against “Agreeing to the resolution that would find Stephen Bannon, adviser to former President Donald Trump, in contempt of Congress for refusal to comply with a subpoena issued by the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol. It would direct the speaker of the House to ‘take all appropriate action to enforce the subpoena’ and certify the committee report (H Rept 117-152) accompanying the contempt resolution to the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia for judicial action.” The bill passed by a vote of 229-202. [CQ. 10/21/21; H.Res. 730, Vote 329, 10/21/21]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miller-Meeks Voted Against Impeaching Trump For Incitement Of An Insurrection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miller-Meeks Voted Against Impeaching Trump For Incitement Of An Insurrection And Said Impeachment “Would Create A Bigger Wedge And Divide In Our Country.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller-Meeks Voted Against Impeaching Trump For Incitement Of An Insurrection. In January 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against “Adoption of the article of impeachment that would impeach President Donald Trump for incitement of insurrection by ‘inciting violence against the government of the United States.’ Specifically, it would state that Trump ‘repeatedly issued false statements’ asserting that the results of the 2020 presidential election were the product of widespread fraud and should not be accepted or certified. It would state that Trump made statements at a rally on Jan. 6, 2020, that ‘encouraged -- and foreseeably resulted in -- lawless action’ at the Capitol building during the certification of electoral college votes, during which protesters entered the Capitol, attacked law enforcement personnel, ‘menaced’ members of Congress and the vice president, and engaged in other ‘violent, deadly, destructive, and seditious acts.’ It would state that Trump's conduct on Jan. 6 followed prior efforts ‘to subvert and obstruct’ the certification of 2020 presidential election results, including during a Jan. 2 phone call during which he urged Georgia Secretary of State Brad Raffensperger to ‘find’ enough votes to overturn the state's presidential election results and ‘threatened Secretary Raffensperger if he failed to do so.’ It would state President Trump's ‘endangered the security of the United States and its institutions of government’ and that he ‘threatened the integrity of the democratic system, interfered with the peaceful transition of power, and imperiled a coordinate branch of government.’ Pursuant to the rule (H Res 41), upon adoption of the article of impeachment, the House agreed to the resolution (H Res 40) that would appoint and authorize the following impeachment trial managers to conduct the impeachment trial against President Donald Trump in the Senate: Reps. Raskin, D-Md., DeGette, D-Colo., Cicilline, D-R.I., Castro, D-Texas, Swalwell, D-Calif., Lieu, D-Calif., Plaskett, D-V.I., Neguse, D-Colo., and Dean, D-Pa.” The article of impeachment was adopted, 232-197. [H. Res. 24, Vote #17, 1/13/21; CQ. 1/13/21]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miller-Meeks Said Impeaching Trump In January 2021 Would “Only Further Divide The Nation” And “There Are Other Ways To Hold The President Accountable”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Miller-Meeks: Impeaching Trump “With 7 Days Remaining In His Term Would Only Further Divide The Nation And Make It More Difficult For President-Elect Joe Biden To Unify And Lead Our Nation.” “WASHINGTON, D.C. – Today, January 13th, 2021, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02) issued the following statement regarding her opposition to articles of impeachment: ‘As horrific as the events of January 6 were, President Trump has conceded and committed to an orderly transition of power on January 20. Impeaching him with 7 days remaining in his term would only further divide the nation and make it more difficult for President-Elect Joe Biden to unify and lead our nation. The people of Iowa sent me to Congress to work on health care reform, lower the cost of prescription drugs, and get Iowans safely back to work. That will be my focus.’” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 1/13/21]

Miller-Meeks: Removing Trump Following The January 6th Insurrection “Would Create A Bigger Wedge And Divide In Our Country” Rather Than “Heal Our Nation.” “Iowa Republican U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, who joined Congress provisionally this week while her election is being contested, said Thursday she thinks Trump should finish out his term. Removing him, she said, wouldn't help 'heal our nation.' ‘To go through another impeachment process, I think, would create a bigger wedge and divide in our country,’ she said. 'It is time for compassion. It is time for understanding.’” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 1/8/21]

Miller-Meeks Said “There Are Other Ways To Hold The President Accountable” Regarding Impeachment Talks Following The January 6th Insurrection. “Iowa freshman Republican U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks on Wednesday said ‘there are other ways to hold the president accountable’ for last week's deadly ‘rampage’ at the U.S. Capitol besides impeachment. ‘As horrific and devastating as the rampage on the Capitol was on Jan. 6, President Trump has conceded. He has committed to a peaceful and orderly transition of power on Jan. 20,’ Miller-Meeks said Wednesday morning, speaking on a news radio program on WMT-AM in Cedar Rapids, as the U.S. House for a second time deliberated impeaching President Donald Trump. Miller-Meeks reiterated on Wednesday that impeaching Trump a week shy of the end of his term would ‘only further divide the nation and make it more difficult for President-elect Joe Biden to unify and lead our nation.’” [Quad-City Times, 1/13/21]

HEADLINE: Quad-City Times: “Miller-Meeks: Trump Should Stay And 'Plenty Of Blame To Go Around' For US Capitol Riot.” [Quad-City Times, 1/7/21]

Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Resolution Calling On Vice President Pence To Invoke The 25th Amendment And Remove Trump From Office

Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Resolution Calling On Vice President Pence To Invoke The 25th Amendment And Remove Trump From Office. In January 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against “Agreeing to the resolution that would state that the House of Representatives calls on Vice President Mike Pence to use his powers under section 4 of the 25th Amendment to convene and mobilize members of the president's cabinet to declare that President Donald Trump is unable to successfully discharge the duties and powers of his office, and to transmit notice to Congress that Pence will immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as acting president. The resolution would state among its findings that Trump ‘widely advertised and broadly encouraged’ participation in the march on the U.S. Capitol on Wednesday, Jan. 6, which turned into a violent insurrectionary mob that resulted in 5 deaths following the storming of the Capitol building; did not appeal to his followers to exit the Capitol during the insurrection; refused to accept the results of the 2020 presidential election as legitimate; and made at least three attempts to intervene in the vote counting and certification process in the state of Georgia and to ‘coerce’ its state officials to declare him the winner of the state's electoral votes.” The resolution passed, 223-205. [H. Res. 21, Vote #14, 1/12/21; CQ, 1/12/21]

Miller-Meeks Voted Against Blocking Republican-Proposed Commissions Intended To “Deflect The Anger Directed At Trump” And Considered To Be Alternatives To Impeaching Trump

Miller-Meeks Voted Against Blocking A Resolution Establishing A Bipartisan 9/11-Style Commission To Investigate The January 6th Attack On The U.S. Capitol. In January 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against a “McGovern, D-Mass., motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and possibility of amendment) on
the rule (H Res 41).” According to the Congressional Record, Rep. Cole stated: “Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to immediately bring up a resolution establishing a bipartisan national commission on the domestic terrorist attack on the United States Capitol. This proposed bipartisan commission will be tasked with examining and reporting upon the terror attack upon our Capitol that occurred last Wednesday. The commission will be bipartisan in nature, modeled after the 9/11 Commission, and will fully be empowered to undertake a full investigation and make recommendations to the President and to Congress. I can think of no more appropriate path for Congress to follow than by ensuring a bipartisan commission reviews all evidence and reports back to us on this horrific event.” A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of the resolution. The motion was agreed to, 221-205. [H. Res. 41, Vote #15, 1/13/21; CQ, 1/13/21]

- **Republicans Proposed The Commission As An Alternative To Impeaching Trump For His Role In The January 6th Capitol Insurrection.** “House Republicans argued Wednesday that instead of impeaching President Donald Trump, Congress should create a commission to study what happened last week. Modeled after the bipartisan commission that analyzed the 9/11 terrorism attacks, the body would recommend how to prevent attacks on the Capitol in the future. ‘I can think of no more appropriate path for Congress to follow,’ said Oklahoma Rep. Tom Cole, the top Republican on the House Rules Committee.” [USA Today, 1/13/21]

**Miller-Meeks Voted Against Blocking A Resolution Establishing A Bipartisan 9/11-Style Commission To Investigate The January 6th Attack On The U.S. Capitol.** In January 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against “Agreeing to the Scanlon, D-Pa., motion to order the previous question (thus ending the debate and possibility of amendment).” According to the Congressional Record, Rep. Cole stated: “Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to immediately bring up a resolution establishing a bipartisan national commission on the domestic terrorist attack on the United States Capitol. This commission, modeled on the 9/11 Commission, will be charged with examining and reporting upon the facts and causes relating to the attack that occurred on January 6 of 2021 and with providing appropriate findings, conclusions, and recommendations for corrective measures. I can think of no more appropriate path for Congress to follow, Mr. Speaker, than to ensure that a bipartisan commission reviews all evidence and reports back to us on this horrific event.” A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of the resolution. The motion was agreed to, 219-206. [H. Res. 21, Vote #12, 1/12/21; CQ, 1/12/21]

- **Republicans Proposed The Commission In Effort To “Deflect The Anger Directed At Trump” Amid Democratic Calls For Vice President Pence To Invoke The 25th Amendment And Remove Trump From The Presidency.** “The House passed on Tuesday evening a searing resolution urging Vice President Mike Pence to invoke the 25th Amendment to expel President Donald Trump for inciting the violent mob that stormed the Capitol last week […] Republicans sought to deflect the anger directed at Trump by proposing a commission to investigate the forces and causes behind the insurrection. Rep. Tom Cole, an Oklahoma Republican, called the effort to prod Pence ‘misguided and inappropriate,’ noting that the 25th Amendment gives Congress no explicit role in suggesting a vice president to declare a president unfit.” [Dallas Morning News, 1/12/21]

### Miller-Meeks Spoke At A Rally With “Racist Provocateur And Holocaust Denier” Nick Fuentes, Who Was Later Subpoenaed For His Role In The January 6th Insurrection, And Did Not Object When Fuentes Called For A “Monoculture”

**2019: Miller-Meeks Spoke At A Rally With “Racist Provocateur And Holocaust Denier” Nick Fuentes, And Did Not Object When Fuentes Called For A “Monoculture”**

**December 2019: Miller-Meeks Spoke At A Rally With Nick Fuentes, Who Marched In The Deadly 2017 Unite The Right Rally In Charlottesville, Virginia.** “Nick Fuentes spoke Dec. 2 at the church during a gathering billed as an immigration forum organized by Scott County Teenage Republicans. Fuentes, who marched in the deadly 2017 Unite the Right rally in Charlottesville, Virginia, Fuentes called for development of a ‘monoculture’ in the United States and spoke against diversity in his remarks. Other speakers at the Dec. 2 gathering at the church included ‘angel families,’ family members of people killed by immigrants in the United States illegally, and
Republican candidates for Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District seat, Bobby Schilling and Iowa Sen. Mariannette Miller-Meeks. Although no one objected to Fuentes’ remarks on Dec. 2, Schilling and Miller-Meeks denounced him the next day. Schilling also fired a staffer he said had coordinated Fuentes’ appearance. Michael Sisco had served for more than a month as Schilling’s ground-game coordinator.” [The Quad-City Times, 12/8/19]

- **Iowa City Press-Citizen: Nick Fuentes Was A “Racist Provocateur And Holocaust Denier” Who Even Far Right Conservative Ideologues Like Ben Shapiro Considered “White Supremacist Garbage.”** “This week, two Republican candidates for Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District took to Twitter to denounce Nick Fuentes, a racist provocateur and Holocaust denier, after Fuentes spoke at the same political rally in Bettendorf they appeared at. The Quad-City Times reported that both Mariannette Miller-Meeks and Bobby Schilling spoke at a forum at Pleasant View Baptist Church focused on immigration Monday night. The event hosted by the Scott County Teenage Republicans revolved around the testimonies of ‘angel parents,’ or people whose children were killed by undocumented immigrants, to advocate for more stringent immigration enforcement, construction of a wall along the United States’ border with Mexico and the hoped-for reelection of Donald Trump in 2020. Fuentes reportedly used racist arguments that decried both illegal and legal migration. Even conservative ideologues on the far right like Ben Shapiro have characterized Fuentes' views as ‘white supremacist garbage,’ as Shapiro described it at a Stanford University speech in November.” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 12/5/19]

**Miller-Meeks Did Not Object When Fuentes Called For Development Of A “Monoculture” In The United States And Spoke Against Diversity In His Remarks.** “Fuentes called for development of a ‘monoculture’ in the United States and spoke against diversity in his remarks. Other speakers at the Dec. 2 gathering at the church included ‘angel families,’ family members of people killed by immigrants in the United States illegally, and Republican candidates for Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District seat, Bobby Schilling and Iowa Sen. Mariannette Miller-Meeks. Although no one objected to Fuentes’ remarks on Dec. 2, Schilling and Miller-Meeks denounced him the next day. Schilling also fired a staffer he said had coordinated Fuentes’ appearance. Michael Sisco had served for more than a month as Schilling’s ground-game coordinator.” [The Quad-City Times, 12/8/19]

**Miller-Meeks Denounced Fuentes The Next Day, Saying She Had Not Been Aware Who He Was Or What He Represented, But Some Felt She Had “Condemned Fuentes, But Not His Ideas”**

**Miller-Meeks Denounced Fuentes The Next Day.** “Fuentes called for development of a ‘monoculture’ in the United States and spoke against diversity in his remarks. Other speakers at the Dec. 2 gathering at the church included ‘angel families,’ family members of people killed by immigrants in the United States illegally, and Republican candidates for Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District seat, Bobby Schilling and Iowa Sen. Mariannette Miller-Meeks. Although no one objected to Fuentes’ remarks on Dec. 2, Schilling and Miller-Meeks denounced him the next day. Schilling also fired a staffer he said had coordinated Fuentes’ appearance. Michael Sisco had served for more than a month as Schilling’s ground-game coordinator.” [The Quad-City Times, 12/8/19]

- **Cedar Rapids Gazette Columnist Lyz Lenz: Following Her Event Appearance With Neo-Nazi Nick Fuentes, Miller-Meeks “Condemned Fuentes, But Not His Ideas.”** “But while King may be gone, the reality is that racism is endemic among elected leaders in Iowa, it just hides behind a nicer veneer. In December of 2019, Republican candidate for congress in Iowa's 2nd District, Mariannette Miller-Meeks, appeared alongside neo-Nazi Nick Fuentes at an anti-immigration event in Bettendorf. Miller Meeks later condemned Fuentes, but not his ideas.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, Lyz Lenz Column, 6/10/20]

**Miller-Meeks Said She Was Not Aware Who Fuentes Was Or Represented.** “The Press-Citizen reached out to Miller-Meeks and Bobby Schilling for context on their attendance at the forum. ‘I’ve spent my life and career trying to treat everyone with the same respect that I would want to be treated with,’ Miller-Meeks said in a release. ‘As I said yesterday (on Twitter), I wasn’t aware who Nick Fuentes was or what he represented. Had I known, I would not have attended and I certainly would have encouraged the Scott County Teenage Republicans to cancel his appearance.’” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 12/5/19]
Miller-Meeks: “There Is No Room In This Country For Racism, Antisemitism, Xenophobia And Hate.”

“There is no room in this country for racism, antisemitism, xenophobia and hate,” Miller-Meeks tweeted Tuesday. “I have been a long supporter of Israel and celebrate people of all backgrounds.” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 12/5/19]

Fuentes Was Later Involved In The January 6th Insurrection And Was Subpoenaed By The January 6th Select Committee In January 2022 To Testify On His Role

January 2022: Fuentes Was Subpoenaed By The January 6th Select Committee For His Involvement In The January 6th Insurrection. “The panel investigating the Jan. 6 insurrection on Wednesday subpoenaed two fringe far-right figures, known for spreading misinformation about the results of the 2020 election and urging Republicans to overturn it. Nick Fuentes, a head of the extremist America First movement, has gained prominence by agitating false claims about election fraud and was on Capitol grounds on Jan. 6, 2021, although there’s no evidence he entered the building. Fuentes, a white nationalist who celebrated the attack in its aftermath, notably hosted Rep. Paul Gosar (R-Ariz.) as a keynote speaker at a conference last year, just weeks after the attack.” [Politico, 1/19/22]

2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Removing Rep. Marjorie Taylor Greene From Her Committee Assignments

February 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Removing Rep. Marjorie Taylor Greene From Her Committee Assignments. In February 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against: “Agreeing to the resolution that would remove Rep. Marjorie Taylor Greene, R-Ga., from the House Budget and Education and Labor committees. It would state that, under the rules of the House, members and employees must ‘behave at all times in a manner that shall reflect creditably on the House” and that Rep. Greene should be removed "in light of conduct she has exhibited.’” The resolution passed 230 to 199. [H Res 72, Vote #25, 2/4/21; CQ, 2/4/21]

Miller-Meeks Compared Violence At The January 6th Insurrection To 2020 Racial Justice Protests, The Latter Of Which She Falsely Claimed Biden Had Not Condemned


Quad-City Times: Miller-Meeks Claimed If Democrats Were Not Blamed For Violence During Protests Against Police Killings, “Trump And Republicans Likewise Should Not Be Held To Blame For The U.S. Capitol Riot.” “Miller-Meeks said that if Democrats were not blamed or held accountable for violence that erupted during protests this summer over police killings of unarmed Black men and women, Trump and Republicans likewise should not be held to blame for the U.S. Capitol riot and Americans expressing ‘grievances’ over what numerous state and federal courts and election officials have found was a free and fair election. ‘Just as over the summer when we saw social unrest and violence and destruction of public and private property, and encampments in various cities, the Democrats did not demand that this action stop,’ Miller-Meeks falsely claimed. Before he spoke out against violence in Portland at the end of August, Biden had condemned violent protests soon after the death of George Floyd.” [Quad-City Times, 1/7/21]

Cedar Rapids Gazette: Miller-Meeks’ Claims About A Lack Of Accountability For Summer Violence Tied To Racial Injustices Ignored “Widespread Condemnation, Including From Biden, Of The Street Violence.” “Althoughcondemning the mob violence, Miller-Meeks echoed Trump's claims of ’fraud’ in the election - without offering evidence - and said, 'There is plenty of blame to go around to all of us.' She suggested if Democrats weren't blamed or held accountable for summer violence tied to racial injustices, Trump and Republicans shouldn't be blamed for the Capitol riot. 'Just as over the summer when we saw social unrest and violence and destruction of public and private property and encampments in various cities, the Democrats did not demand that this action stop,' Miller-Meeks said - ignoring widespread condemnation, including from Biden, of the street violence.” [Cedar

Miller-Meeks said Wednesday evening she was encouraging people to disperse and to peacefully protest away from the Capitol. She said it was 'incumbent' on Trump and Vice President Mike Pence to do the same 'and to decry and denounce any violent activities that are going on on the Capitol grounds.' While 'strongly in support of the Constitutional right to protest, protesting should be peaceful and should not be breaching buildings or storming the Capitol,' Miller-Meeks told reporters. 'People are angry. They're frustrated. They're disappointed. All of that is understandable. ... People can be engaged. They can be passionate, but should not rise to the level of destroying property.”” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 1/6/21]

2019: Miller-Meeks Said She Supported An Individual’s 2nd Amendment Rights “So That They Can Support Themselves Against A Government That Becomes Tyrannical.”

“I believe the 2nd Amendment to be an individual right and that citizens have the right to bear arms per our constitution so that they can support themselves against a government that becomes tyrannical.” [YouTube, Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 11/14/19] (VIDEO) 00:00:13
**Miller-Meeks’ Lies And Extreme Record Made Her A Threat To Iowans’ Health**

### Significant Findings

**Miller-Meeks Repeatedly Spread Misinformation About COVID-19, Including Claiming That Children Could Not Transmit COVID-19 And Spreading A Satirical Story That Unvaccinated Veterans Would Lose Their VA Benefits.**

- In July 2021, Miller-Meeks falsely claimed elementary-school-aged children did not transmit COVID-19 to each other or adults, in arguing that requiring mask mandates in schools was “not following the science.”
  - An *Ottumwa Courier* editorial called Miller-Meeks’ claim “patently false” and a *Cedar Rapids Gazette* fact check gave her “inaccurate” claim a “D” grade.

- In September 2021, Miller-Meeks tweeted a false story from a clearly marked parody website about Biden ordering the VA to withhold benefits from unvaccinated veterans, adding “If true, this is insane!”
  - Miller-Meeks stood by her decision to share misinformation that veterans’ benefits were at risk, claiming the false story made a “powerful point.”
  - The false story was so widely shared after Miller-Meeks posted it that a Georgia VA hospital was forced to send an emergency alert, assuring veterans their benefits were not threatened.

- Miller-Meeks repeatedly undermined efforts to encourage vaccination by promoting natural immunity as superior to vaccine-acquired immunity, including through false characterization of CDC data.

- Miller-Meeks promoted hydroxychloroquine as a COVID treatment, despite medical consensus that it was ineffective or even harmful.

- Miller-Meeks suggested lockdowns, isolation, and hospital closures caused more excess deaths than COVID-19 itself had caused.

  - Miller-Meeks’ claim that early pandemic closures limiting hospital services had caused 98,000 deaths unrelated to COVID was given a “C” grade by a *Cedar Rapids Gazette* fact check.

  - Miller-Meeks said in May 2020 that she would have recommended a 2–3-week shutdown of businesses and travel during the start of the pandemic if consulted by President Trump, but later said she opposed pandemic closures.

**On The Campaign Trail, Miller-Meeks Called For Another Round Of Stimulus Checks And An Extension Of Unemployment Benefits, But Then Flip-Flopped And Specifically Opposed Those Measures In The American Rescue Plan.**

- Shortly before the 2020 election, Miller-Meeks called for another round of direct stimulus payments to households and an extension of expanded pandemic unemployment insurance.

  - However, after President Biden took office, Miller-Meeks flip-flopped, saying it was too soon to consider further stimulus payments and blaming pandemic UI for causing labor shortages by discouraging work.
Miller-Meeks voted against the American Rescue Plan and condemned it as “only tangentially related to the COVID pandemic.”

Miller-Meeks Frequently Flouted Mask Rules, Resulting In Multiple Fines From The U.S. House, And Claimed That Masks Were Unnecessary Because COVID-19 Was Not Transmitted Through The Air.

- Miller-Meeks opposed mask mandates and was fined $2500 for repeated violations of the House’s COVID protocols by refusing to wear a mask while on the House floor.
  - Miller-Meeks used her refusal to obey House COVID protocol as the basis for a fundraising appeal.
- Miller-Meeks had previously refused to wear a mask on the Iowa Senate floor in 2020, arguing that maintaining 6 feet of distance from others was sufficient protection because the virus “scientifically [...] is not aerosolized” and was not transmitted through the air, a flatly inaccurate statement.
- Miller-Meeks refused to answer a reporter’s questions at a fundraiser because the reporter would not remove his mask.

Miller-Meeks Flip-Flopped On Abortion, Made False Claims To Oppose Roe V. Wade, And Voted To Defund Planned Parenthood And Restrict Iowans’ Reproductive Freedoms.

- Miller-Meeks flip-flopped on abortion, calling herself “pro-choice” as recently as 2018 but “100 percent pro-life” as of the 2020 Republican primary.
  - May 2018: Miller-Meeks said, “I’m also Catholic, I am pro-choice, but it’s a very sensitive issue.”
  - Miller-Meeks said abortion discussions were best left to providers, doctors, and patients.
  - May 2020: Miller-Meeks said she “misspoke” when she called herself pro-choice in 2018, claiming “my record is 100 percent pro-life.”
    - May 2020: Miller-Meeks said she had misspoken when she called herself pro-choice in 2018.
    - Iowa City Press-Citizen: Miller-Meeks’ 2020 anti-abortion stance was “seemingly a shift from 2018.”
    - June 2020: Miller-Meeks’ primary opponent said his campaign got Miller-Meeks to “embrace a more pro-life position” which he considered “a win.”
- September 2021: Miller-Meeks voted against the Women’s Health Protection Act, which would codify Roe v. Wade
  - Miller-Meeks made multiple false claims about Roe v. Wade, saying the ruling permitted abortion on demand up to birth (though it allowed abortion bans post-viability) and that it was “only temporary” and “only until women have access to birth control.”
- Miller-Meeks voted for a state HHS appropriations bill that prohibited grant funding for Planned Parenthood and said that Planned Parenthood was “synonymous” with abortion.
Mariannette Miller-Meeks voted against the expressed wishes of her constituents to repeal Iowans’ right to abortion access with a constitutional amendment.

Miller-Meeks said she was “lobbied heavily by constituents” to vote against the constitutional amendment but voted in favor of the amendment “because that’s what I believed in.”

Miller-Meeks Repeatedly Opposed The Affordable Care Act And Called For Its Repeal.

Miller-Meeks was a staunch opponent of the Affordable Care Act, which she claimed failed to lower premiums and limited patient choice of insurance and providers.

Under Miller-Meeks’ Leadership, The Iowa Department Of Public Health Was Plagued By Controversies.

Miller-Meeks signed a secret $20,000 settlement with an employee who lost her job but filed a grievance stating that her termination was based on politics.

DMR Editorial: Miller-Meeks failed to stand up for HIV-positive Iowans when a federally funded high-risk insurance pool refused to provide health insurance to Iowans that were HIV-positive.

The Department came under fire after a state audit report exposed the agency had failed to inspect funeral homes as required by state law; Miller-Meeks admitted IDPH had not inspected funeral homes for “decades” prior to the audit.

Miller-Meeks was accused of disregarding state law by not consulting the Tobacco Use Prevention and Control Commission before hiring a new administrator for the tobacco use prevention division.

The administrator Miller-Meeks hired had questionable qualifications, with no management experience and little background in tobacco policy or public health.

Miller-Meeks’ failure to consult the commission was cited by a critical legislator as evidence of her weak management skills.

Miller-Meeks cut the position of Iowa’s Division of Tobacco Use Prevention and Control official and said the move was due to budget cuts that left the division too small to operate alone.

Sen. Herman Quirmbach and anti-smoking activists questioned the move, saying Miller-Meeks had spoken of her intent to dissolve the division entirely.

Miller-Meeks then named IDPH’s medical director as interim administrator, but backed off when state senators noted the move violated state law requiring a full-time head of the division with no other duties.

Miller-Meeks claimed she had spoken to the Iowa Attorney General who said her actions were legal, but the AG’s spokesperson said he did not advise Miller-Meeks.

Miller-Meeks Was A Serial Spreader Of Dangerous COVID-Related Misinformation

July 2021: Miller-Meeks Falsely Claimed Children Do Not Transmit COVID-19 And That Requiring Masks In School Was “Not Following The Science”

Miller-Meeks Claimed Elementary Age Students “Don’t Transmit [COVID-19] To Adults Or Other
“Been saying this since last summer. Teachers can be protected. Elementary age students rarely die or are seriously ill and don’t transmit virus to adults or other children. Global poverty has exploded also and will take decades to reverse.” QUOTE TWEET @UNICEF: “To prevent the COVID-19 pandemic from having a life-long impact on an entire generation of children and young people - especially the most vulnerable, governments must reopen schools and recover lost learning.” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 7/17/21]

Miller-Meeks: “We Have Known For Over A Year That Children Don’t Transmit The Virus.” MACDONALD: “Major push back now against Dr. Fauci. He says children age 2 or older should wear masks, but the WHO says children under age 5 don’t need to wear masks. There’s a lot of confusion about this. What do you say to this?” MILLER-MEEKS: “It’s the same reason why there’s vaccine hesitancy and that’s because we continue to get mixed messages from the so-called experts. So, the WHO has said children under 5 don’t need to wear masks. Even as far back as almost a year ago, the American Journal of Pediatrics had published that children don’t transmit. So, children up to the elementary school age, so that would be up until 6th grade, don’t transmit the virus to other children or to adults. Children get the virus from other adults, but they weren’t transmitting it. And that may be because they have a better immune system and a better T-cell immune system, but nonetheless, we have known for over a year that children don’t transmit the virus.” [Fox Business, 7/14/21] (VIDEO) 00:00:57

Miller-Meeks: “To Say We’re Not Going To Let Children Go Back To School Unless They’re Wearing Masks Is Not Following The Science.” “We have known for over a year that children don’t transmit the virus. So delaying children going to summer camps, being outdoors where there’s almost infinitesimally low transmission, it seems absurd to have children wearing masks when they’re outdoors playing in sports and certainly in the elementary age group. I think to say we’re not going to let children go back to school unless they’re wearing masks is not following the science.” [Fox Business, 7/14/21] (VIDEO) 00:01:50

Cedar Rapids Gazette Fact Check Gave Miller-Meeks’ Claim That Children Do Not Transmit COVID-19 A “D” Grade, Noted It Was “Inaccurate” And “Contradicts New CDC Recommendations.” “Miller-Meeks, an ophthalmologist, has been a vocal advocate for Iowans to get the COVID-19 vaccine. But her claims about children not transmitting the virus are inaccurate. Kids can and do pass the virus, although at much lower rates than adults. If Miller-Meeks had qualified her statement even a little, saying children usually don’t transmit the virus, she’d be correct. But she didn’t. And she uses the claim as a reason for saying children don’t need to wear masks in school — a conclusion that contradicts new CDC recommendations. Her statement that ‘elementary age students rarely die or are seriously ill’ is true, which saves her overall grade from an F. Instead, we give her a D.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 8/2/21]

Ottumwa Courier Editorial: Miller-Meeks’ Statement That Children Do Not Transmit COVID-19 Was “Patently False.” “In July, she tweeted that children ‘don't transmit virus to adults or other children.’ She appeared on a Fox Business show with a similar message. We know that statement is patently false. Last week, children accounted for a third of new cases in Iowa.” [Ottumwa Courier, Editorial, 9/14/21]

Cedar Rapids Gazette’s Todd Dorman: “Despite U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks Recent False Claims To The Contrary, Children Can Transmit The Virus, Potentially To Vulnerable Adults At Home.” “A troubling number of cases among children are being recorded in regions where the delta variant is running wild. From the end of July to Aug. 6, the CDC reported an average of 216 children hospitalized daily. And despite U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks recent false claims to the contrary, children can transmit the virus, potentially to vulnerable adults at home.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, Todd Dorman, 8/12/21]

**Miller-Meeks Created A Firestorm Of Controversy By Spreading Disinformation Suggesting Unvaccinated Veterans Would Lose Their Health Benefits**

September 2021: Miller-Meeks Tweeted A False Story About Biden Ordering The VA To Withhold Health Benefits From Unvaccinated Veterans And Suggested It Could Be True
September 2021: Miller-Meeks Shared A Story Claiming That Biden Ordered The VA To Withhold Health Benefits From Unvaccinated Veterans, Adding “If True, This Is Insane!”

The Story Was From Delaware Ohio News, A Satirical Website That Stated On Its Home Page, “Everything On This Website Is Made Up. Do Not Rely On Anything Said Here.” “With all of that said, everything on this website is made up. Do not rely on anything said here.”

Quad-City Times: “Nothing In Miller-Meeks’ Tweet Sharing The Fictional Story, However, Indicates That It Is Satirical, And Instead Insinuates That It Might Be True.” “[Democrats and others on Monday blasted Iowa freshman Republican U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks for sharing a fake news article from a satirical online news website falsely claiming Democratic President Joe Biden's administration of planning to withhold health benefits from unvaccinated veterans. […] Nothing in Miller-Meeks' tweet sharing the fictional story, however, indicates that it is satirical, and instead insinuates that it might be true. A representative for Miller-Meeks did not respond to follow up questions.” [Quad-City Times, 9/13/21]
KCRG: Miller-Meeks Sent A Tweet “Falsely Claiming That President Biden Will Withhold Medical Benefits From Unvaccinated Veterans.” “A tweet by Representative Mariannette Miller-Meeks is causing confusion falsely claiming that President Biden will withhold medical benefits from unvaccinated veterans. The link was shared late Sunday night by Miller-Meeks’ Twitter account. Miller-Meeks, a Republican representing Iowa’s second congressional district, tweeted, ‘If true, this is insane!’ The tweet directed readers to an article claiming that the President will ‘withhold healthcare benefits from unvaccinated veterans as part of an aggressive new initiative to combat the COVID-19 pandemic.’ The article appears on the website DelawareOhioNews.com, a self-described parody website that cautions its readers with a warning, ‘...everything on this website is made up. Do not rely on anything said here.’” [KCRG, 9/13/21]

HEADLINE: “Iowa Congresswoman Tweets Misinformation About Biden, Unvaccinated Veterans.” [WOI, 9/13/21]

Miller-Meeks Stood By Her Decision To Share Misinformation That Veterans’ Benefits Were At Risk, Claiming The Fake Story Made A “Powerful Point”

WOI: Miller-Meeks Was “Standing By Her Decision To Share Misinformation About President Joe Biden And His Actions To Combat The COVID-19 Pandemic.” “Iowa Republican Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks is standing by her decision to share misinformation about President Joe Biden and his actions to combat the COVID-19 pandemic. On Sunday evening, Miller-Meeks tweeted a link to a satirical article from the website DelawareOhioNews.com. She added the statement, ‘If true, this is insane!’ The article describes a fake announcement from President Biden regarding unvaccinated veterans losing their health benefits from the Department of Veteran Affairs. Biden made no such announcement. A disclaimer on DelawareOhioNews.com states, “All stories herein are parodies (satire, fiction, fake, not real) of people and/or actual events. All names are made up (unless used in a parody of public figures) and any similarity is purely coincidental.”” [WOI, 9/13/21]

Miller-Meeks Said The Satirical Story She Shared About Unvaccinated Veterans Being Denied Benefits Made “A Powerful Point.” “Local 5 asked Miller-Meeks for an interview regarding her decision to spread misinformation online through the article, satirical or not. Misinformation is defined as false information that is spread, regardless of intent to mislead. Miller-Meeks declined an interview but provided this statement: ‘I retweeted a story about President Biden requiring the VA to withhold benefits from unvaccinated veterans, saying ’if true, this is insane.’ The story and website is obviously satire and makes a powerful point. President Biden’s executive orders about COVID-19 have been classic examples of government overreach and these days the unbelievable has become reality.’” [WOI, 9/13/21]

• Miller-Meeks’ Spokesperson Declined To Clarify What “Powerful Point” The Article Made. “Local 5 asked for clarification on what ‘powerful point’ the article made, but a spokesperson declined to further clarify.” [WOI, 9/13/21]

The False Story Was Shared Widely After Miller-Meeks Tweeted It, Forcing A Georgia VA Hospital To Send An Emergency Alert Assuring Veterans Their Benefits Were Safe

October 2021: A VA Hospital In Georgia Sent An Emergency Email Alert To Inform Veterans That The Story Miller-Meeks Shared About Unvaccinated Veterans Losing Their Benefits Was Not True. “A Department of Veterans Affairs hospital in Georgia sent an emergency email alert Friday about a false news story on a satirical site that veterans are misconstruing as true. The false article states President Joe Biden ordered the VA to withhold health care benefits from veterans who refuse to receive coronavirus vaccines. The story was published by DelawareOhioNews.com, which describes itself as a satire and parody entertainment website. The Carl Vinson VA Medical Center in Dublin, Ga., issued an email alert Friday to inform veterans that the article is not true. ‘It’s sick,’ the email reads. ‘There is nothing funny about spreading false stories of stripping our heroes of their hard-earned benefits.’ The false article was posted online in September. It was shared widely after a Republican lawmaker from Iowa, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, tweeted about it. Along with a link to the story, she tweeted:
‘If true, this is insane!’ As of Friday, Miller-Meeks tweet had not been deleted, despite the story being marked as satire.” [Stars And Stripes, 10/22/21]

- Stars And Stripes: “The False Article […] Was Shared Widely After A Republican Lawmaker from Iowa, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Tweeted About It.” “The false article was posted online in September. It was shared widely after a Republican lawmaker from Iowa, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, tweeted about it. Along with a link to the story, she tweeted: ‘If true, this is insane!’ As of Friday, Miller-Meeks tweet had not been deleted, despite the story being marked as satire.” [Stars And Stripes, 10/22/21]

Editorials Slammed Miller-Meeks For Spreading Misinformation And For Dismissing Concerns That Her Constituents Took It As Fact

Quad-City Times Editorial Board Gave Miller-Meeks A “Thumbs Down” For “Spreading Misinformation About The Coronavirus And The Biden Administration's Response To It” By “Claiming The Administration Had Instructed The VA To Withhold Benefits From Unvaccinated Veterans.” “Thumbs Down … to Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks for spreading misinformation about the coronavirus and the Biden administration's response to it. Earlier this week, the first-term congresswoman circulated an article on Twitter from a web site claiming the administration had instructed the VA to withhold benefits from unvaccinated veterans. ‘If true, that's insane,’ she tweeted. Of course, the story was false. Anybody with a modicum of common sense could see that. But if that wasn’t enough, it was easy to see the article came from a parody site, delewareohionews.com, which notes on its site that is isn't a real source of information: ‘All stories herein are parodies (satire, fiction, fake, not real).’” [Quad-City Times, Editorial, 9/18/21]

- Quad-City Times Editorial: “Of Course, The Story Was False. Anybody With A Modicum Of Common Sense Could See That.” “Thumbs Down … to Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks for spreading misinformation about the coronavirus and the Biden administration's response to it. Earlier this week, the first-term congresswoman circulated an article on Twitter from a web site claiming the administration had instructed the VA to withhold benefits from unvaccinated veterans. ‘If true, that's insane,’ she tweeted. Of course, the story was false. Anybody with a modicum of common sense could see that. But if that wasn’t enough, it was easy to see the article came from a parody site, delewareohionews.com, which notes on its site that is isn't a real source of information: ‘All stories herein are parodies (satire, fiction, fake, not real).’” [Quad-City Times, Editorial, 9/18/21]

- Quad-City Times Editorial: Miller-Meeks “Left The Phony Article On Her Twitter Feed, Despite Calls For Her To Take It Down; Then She Defended Her Actions And Complained When People Criticized Her For It.” “Of course, the story was false. Anybody with a modicum of common sense could see that. But if that wasn’t enough, it was easy to see the article came from a parody site, delewareohionews.com, which notes on its site that is isn't a real source of information: ‘All stories herein are parodies (satire, fiction, fake, not real).’ That didn’t seem to bother Miller-Meeks, who represents Iowa's 2nd District in Congress. She left the phony article on her Twitter feed, despite calls for her to take it down; then she defended her actions and complained when people criticized her for it.” [Quad-City Times, Editorial, 9/18/21]

Ottumwa Courier Editorial On Miller-Meeks’ COVID Misinformation: “Mariannette Miller-Meeks Can, And Must, Do Better.” “Mariannette Miller-Meeks can, and must, do better. The freshman Republican that represents Iowa's second congressional district in the U.S. House of Representatives has done some good things in her short tenure. But, particularly recently, has shown a concerning detachment from facts and reality — and now a refusal to apologize for it. On Sunday night she retweeted a story from the website Delaware Ohio News. It's a satire website, meaning its content is made up. It doesn't hide this fact; the site even has posted a legal statement to make clear that all stories are ‘satire, fiction, fake, not real.’” [Ottumwa Courier, Editorial, 9/14/21]

Ottumwa Courier Editorial: Miller-Meeks Had “Shown A Concerning Detachment From Facts And Reality — And Now A Refusal To Apologize For It.” “Mariannette Miller-Meeks can, and must, do better. The freshman Republican that represents Iowa's second congressional district in the U.S. House of Representatives has done some
good things in her short tenure. But, particularly recently, has shown a concerning detachment from facts and reality — and now a refusal to apologize for it. On Sunday night she retweeted a story from the website Delaware Ohio News. It's a satire website, meaning its content is made up. It doesn't hide this fact; the site even has posted a legal statement to make clear that all stories are 'satire, fiction, fake, not real.’” [Ottumwa Courier, Editorial, 9/14/21]

Ottumwa Courier Editorial: When Asked About Her Sharing Of COVID Misinformation, Miller-Meeks Was “Dismissive And Deflected.” “On Sunday night she retweeted a story from the website Delaware Ohio News. It's a satire website, meaning its content is made up. […] In a statement provided to some media outlets, Miller-Meeks was dismissive and deflected: 'I retweeted a story about President Biden requiring the VA to withhold benefits from unvaccinated veterans, saying 'if true, this is insane.' The story and website is obviously satire and makes a powerful point. President Biden’s executive orders about COVID-19 have been classic examples of government overreach and these days the unbelievable has become reality.” [Ottumwa Courier, Editorial, 9/14/21]

Ottumwa Courier Editorial: Miller-Meeks Offered “No Apology Or Clarification” For Retweeting COVID Misinformation That “Caused Confusion Among Some Of Her Constituents, Some Of Which Seem To Believe The Story Is True.” “The headline of this completely fake, made-up news story read, ‘Biden Orders VA To Withhold Health Benefits From Unvaccinated Veterans.’ Miller-Meeks' retweet comment was 'If true, this is insane!' […] The tweet remains up two days later. There has been no apology or clarification other than to some members of the press. Clearly it has caused confusion among some of her constituents, some of which seem to believe the story is true.” [Ottumwa Courier, Editorial, 9/14/21]

Miller-Meeks Repeatedly Undermined Efforts To Promote Vaccination By Promoting Natural Immunity From COVID-19 As Superior To Vaccine-Acquired Immunity

Miller-Meeks: “We Should Be Highlighting Immunity, Including Infection Acquired Or Natural Immunity And Not Just Mandating Vaccines And Boosters.” “Which is why we should be highlighting immunity, including infection acquired or natural immunity and not just mandating vaccines and boosters. My bill requiring coverage of serology for antibodies & T-cell antibodies documents immunity.” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 12/18/21]

Miller-Meeks Suggested That Public Health Officials Should Recommend COVID-19 Testing Rather Than Boosters For Children And Those With Previous Infection And That Those Boosters Should Be Sent Overseas. MILLER-MEEKS: “We had five public health experts just recently in this hearing, asked them about infection-acquired immunity, asked them about the Israeli study, and all of them were less than supportive of evidence-based data that has come out about infection-acquired immunity. I put forward a bill to mandate all insurance, both private and federal, cover for serology testing for humoral antibodies and also T-cell antibodies, because we know the T-cell immunity is stronger and lasts longer. But yet, as you’re indicating, when we’re talking about trying to globally vaccinate countries, we’re vaccinating now children 16 to 17, and recommending boosters for individuals who may already have immunity rather than recommending testing for that. We don’t know in children, because the CDC, and I’ve asked this of Doctor Walensky, for those children who have died of COVID-19, what were their risk factors, what were their vulnerabilities? That’s information that we should know before recommending that every child be vaccinated, from the ages of 5-12 or 5-11, and then recommend boosters. Because as I think you indicated, would you agree those boosters could be doses that could go overseas to other countries in order to increase the rates of immunization?” [YouTube, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 12/14/21] (VIDEO) 00:04:52

Miller-Meeks: Infection-Acquired Immunity Was “As Beneficial As Vaccination, And In Some Cases More Beneficial.” MILLER-MEEKS: “And it seems to me that when we do not recognize infection-acquired immunity, which does provide immunity—the studies that have come out of Israel and other studies have shown that it is as beneficial as vaccination, and in some cases more beneficial because it’s not only to the spike protein—that we’re not addressing that and we could have the same accommodations for individuals in the workplace as we’ve had throughout the pandemic knowing that most infections occur at home or elsewhere outside the workplace.” [YouTube, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 10/25/21] (VIDEO) 00:04:13
October 2021: Miller-Meeks Cosponsored A Bill Requiring Federal Agencies To Consider Immunity From Previous COVID-19 Infection When Issuing New Rules Or Regulations Regarding COVID-19. “Today, Florida Congressman Daniel Webster, R-Clment, joined Congresswoman Diana Harshbarger (R-TN) to introduce the Natural Immunity is Real Act in the U.S. House of Representatives. This bill requires federal agencies to take into account naturally acquired immunity from previous COVID-19 infection when issuing any rules or regulations aimed at protecting from COVID-19. […] Additional co-sponsors include: Jeff Van Drew (R-NJ), Chris Steward (R-UT), Bill Posey (R-FL), Mary Miller (R-IL), Mariannette Miller-Meeks (R-IA), Dan Bishop (R-NC), Mo Brooks (R-AL), Madison Cawthorn (R-NC), and Chip Roy (R-TX).” [Office Of Rep. Daniel Webster, Press Release, 10/18/21]

Miller-Meeks Promoted A COVID-19 Study Showing That “Immunized” Family Members Provided Protection Whether Immunity From Vax Or Infection Acquired (Natural).” “Study stressed that ‘immunized’ family members provided protection whether immunity from vax or infection acquired (natural). You address this in your analysis. As a nation we desire immunity for protection and this study indicates conferred from either route.” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 10/15/21]

Miller-Meeks: “I Still Believe There Should Not Be A Mandate” For The COVID-19 Vaccine “And We Should Recognize Natural Immunity, Which We Still Do Not Do.” “Miller-Meeks drew even louder cheers from the crowd of 200 when she called for the resignations of top U-S generals and the U.S. secretary of state. Miller-Meeks also criticized the Biden Administration’s recent move to fine companies with more than 100 employees who do not ensure workers have had a Covid shot or are regularly tested for the virus. ‘Make no mistake, I’ve given vaccine in all 24 counties. I talk to people about the vaccine. I try to persuade them for the vaccine, but I still believe there should not be a mandate and we should recognize natural immunity, which we still do not do,’ she said, to applause.” [Radio Iowa, 9/19/21]

- Iowa City Press-Citizen: “Experts Say That Natural Immunity Is Not A Solution To COVID-19, Since Catching The Virus And Surviving Does Not Give You Enough Protective Antibodies As Does Getting An mRNA Vaccine Like The Moderna Or Pfizer Shot.” “Natural immunity to the COVID-19 pandemic would entail someone catching the virus and recovering from it, giving their immune system experience fighting off the virus. Experts say that natural immunity is not a solution to COVID-19, since catching the virus and surviving does not give you enough protective antibodies as does getting an mRNA vaccine like the Moderna or Pfizer shot.” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 9/18/21]

Miller-Meeks: Biden’s Vaccine Mandate Had “No Recognition Of Natural Immunity Which Is Rapidly Seen As Better” And It Would Be “Challenged In The Courts.” “So why a mandate now? Could Biden’s favorability on handling the pandemic be worsening? Why exempt the postal service? And no recognition of natural immunity which is rapidly seen as better? I support vaccination, but NOT mandate. Gov’t overreach will be challenged in the courts.” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 9/9/21]

After A Professor Was Granted A COVID-19 Vaccine Exemption Due To Prior Infection, Miller-Meeks Said It Was “Extraordinary That One Should Even Have To Go To Court To Prove Science Of Naturalized Immunity Which Was Commonly Acknowledged And Accepted Prior To COVID.” “Great news, but extraordinary that one should even have to go to court to prove science of naturalized immunity which was commonly acknowledged and accepted prior to COVID.” QUOTE TWEET @MartinKulldorff: “After lawsuit, @GeorgeMasonU grants professor @ToddZywicky a medical exemption to #COVID vaccine. He already has excellent immunity from prior COVID infection.” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 8/18/21]

Miller-Meeks Said Previous Infection With COVID-19 Should Be Sufficient To Bypass An Employer Vaccine Mandate. MILLER-MEEKS: “Well, I don't think that we should have a federal mandate for the COVID-19 vaccines. But interestingly enough, working in the hospitals in which I was a staff member, hospitals required us to get vaccinated for influenza. Now, you could appeal that decision or you could ask for a waiver if you had a medical reason that you could not be vaccinated, if you had an allergy, or if you had previous, and I think in this
case, if you can show that you've had previous infection with COVID-19, you ought to be able to use that for an employer. So, I think no vaccine mandate by the federal government, but I certainly understand businesses wanting to protect all of their employees and their customers, and so they may ask for an individual to provide a waiver and/or waiver liability.” [Fox Business, 6/14/21] (VIDEO) 00:02:50

Miller-Meeks Falsey Characterized CDC Data To Claim That It Showed Natural Immunity Was Equally Effective As Vaccination At Preventing Infection

Miller-Meeks Claimed That The CDC’s Morbidity And Mortality Weekly Report Showed That “Infection-Acquired Immunity Is As Equally Effective As Vaccine Immunity.” MILLER-MEEKS: “However, this week, in the Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report from the CDC, we find that infection-acquired immunity is as equally effective as vaccine immunity. So, we should be talking about immunity and getting people immune.” [YouTube, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 11/5/21] (VIDEO) 00:00:45

- The CDC’s Report Showed That Unvaccinated Adults With Previous COVID-19 Infection Were 5.49 Times More Likely To Get COVID-19 Than Fully Vaccinated Individuals With No Previous Infection. “Among COVID-19–like illness hospitalizations among adults aged ≥18 years whose previous infection or vaccination occurred 90–179 days earlier, the adjusted odds of laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 among unvaccinated adults with previous SARS-CoV-2 infection were 5.49-fold higher than the odds among fully vaccinated recipients of an mRNA COVID-19 vaccine who had no previous documented infection (95% confidence interval = 2.75–10.99).” [Centers For Disease Control And Prevention, 11/5/21]

- CDC: “Vaccine-Induced Immunity Was More Protective Than Infection-Induced Immunity Against Laboratory-Confirmed COVID-19.” “In this U.S.-based epidemiologic analysis of patients hospitalized with COVID-19–like illness whose previous infection or vaccination occurred 90–179 days earlier, vaccine-induced immunity was more protective than infection-induced immunity against laboratory-confirmed COVID-19, including during a period of Delta variant predominance. All eligible persons should be vaccinated against COVID-19 as soon as possible, including unvaccinated persons previously infected with SARS-CoV-2.” [Centers For Disease Control And Prevention, 11/5/21]

Miller-Meeks On COVID-19: “Immunity, Not Merely Vaccination, Is What Is Important.” “Immunity, not merely vaccination, is what is important and why we should test for both humoral antibodies and T-cells.” QUOTE TWEET @Pantera793: “Of note, we detected cross-reactive T cell responses directed against the spike and/or membrane proteins of SARS-CoV-2 in 28% of unexposed healthy blood donors, consistent with a high degree of pre-existing immunity in the general population”’” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 10/31/21]

- October 2021: The CDC Published Data Reinforcing That Vaccination Is The Best Protection Against COVID-19” And Finding That Vaccination Was Superior To Immunity From Prior Infection. “Today, CDC published new science reinforcing that vaccination is the best protection against COVID-19. In a new MMWR examining more than 7,000 people across 9 states who were hospitalized with COVID-like illness, CDC found that those who were unvaccinated and had a recent infection were 5 times more likely to have COVID-19 than those who were recently fully vaccinated and did not have a prior infection.” [Centers For Disease Control And Prevention, Press Release, 10/29/21]

- CDC: “Vaccination Can Provide A Higher, More Robust, And More Consistent Level Of Immunity To Protect People From Hospitalization For COVID-19 Than Infection Alone For At Least 6 Months.” “The data demonstrate that vaccination can provide a higher, more robust, and more consistent level of immunity to protect people from hospitalization for COVID-19 than infection alone for at least 6 months.” [Centers For Disease Control And Prevention, Press Release, 10/29/21]

Ottumwa Courier Editorial: Miller-Meeks “Promoted Natural Immunity As Being Supreme To COVID-19 Vaccinations” When “There Isn't Enough Information To Make That Statement.” “Sunday's Tweet was far from her first offense. Miller-Meeks — an eye doctor and not an expert on vaccines or infectious disease — has
promoted natural immunity as being supreme to COVID-19 vaccinations. There isn't enough information to make that statement, and currently, peer-reviewed studies point to vaccinations offering better immunity. Last month, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention released a study that showed a vaccination against COVID-19 offered more protection than previous infection. This means two things: those who have had COVID should still get vaccinated, and those who haven't gotten COVID should get vaccinated.” [Ottumwa Courier, Editorial, 9/14/21]

Miller-Meeks Promoted Hydroxychloroquine As A COVID Treatment In Defiance Of Medical Consensus

Miller-Meeks Criticized Regulations That Prevented Doctors From Prescribing Alternative Drugs For COVID Patients. “While Miller-Meeks did not directly cite medications that have primarily been used to treat malaria or to deworm livestock, she criticized regulations during the pandemic which have prevented doctors from prescribing alternative drugs for Covid patients. ‘We’ve had governors make decisions over what drugs doctors can prescribe their patients under the penalty of doctors losing their license,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘We’ve seen government bureaucracy interfere with the doctor-patient relationship, whether it’s prescribing treatments, what they can get through hospitalization.’” [Radio Iowa, 11/5/21]

March 2020: Miller-Meeks Tweeted And Then Deleted “If I Were Seriously Ill From COVID-19, Having Read The Research, I Would Want To Try Hydroxychloroquine.” “State Sen. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, a physician and Republican candidate for Congress, said in a tweet if she became infected with COVID-19, she would want to try a malaria drug for treatment that a new, large study shows has no benefit and may have worsened health outcomes. In the March 22 tweet, which has since been deleted, Miller-Meeks said: ‘As an ophthalmologist, I take care of people frequently who are on hydroxychloroquine. It has a high safety profile and if I were seriously ill from COVID-19, having read the research, I would want to try hydroxychloroquine.’” On March 21, President Donald Trump promoted the drug, calling it ‘a real chance to be one of the biggest game changers in the history of medicine.’ …be put in use IMMEDIATELY. PEOPLE ARE DYING, MOVE FAST, and GOD BLESS EVERYONE! @US_FDA @SteveFDA @CDCgov @DHSgov — Donald J. Trump (@realDonaldTrump) March 21, 2020. A new study of the drug’s impact on coronavirus patients showed no benefit and potentially did more harm than good when used on 368 men at Veterans Health Administration medical centers across the country.” [Iowa Starting Line, 4/22/20]

Miller-Meeks’ Tweet About Hydroxychloroquine Was Posted One Day After Trump Praised The Unauthorized Treatment. “In a since deleted March 22 social media post, Miller-Meeks, a physician and state senator from Ottumwa, said that if she contracted COVID-19, she would want to be placed on a treatment of hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin. That was posted a day after President Donald Trump said
hydroxychloroquine was ‘a real chance to be one of the biggest game changers in the history of medicine.’ ‘Iowans deserve to know that in the middle of a global pandemic, Mariannette Miller-Meeks recklessly touted a drug that scientific evidence shows caused even more death in coronavirus patients,’ said Brooke Goren of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee. ‘If Miller-Meeks is already putting politics ahead of patients now, how can Iowans trust her to put them ahead of partisan gamesmanship in Washington?’” [Quad-City Times, 6/25/20]

HEADLINE: Iowa Starting Line: “IA-02: Miller-Meeks Touted Unproven Malaria Drug For COVID Cases.” [Iowa Starting Line, 4/22/20]

Miller-Meeks Suggested Lockdowns And Hospital Closures Caused More Excess Deaths Than COVID-19 Itself

December 2021: Miller-Meeks Alleged That There Had Been More “Excess Deaths” Resulting From COVID-19 Lockdowns And Isolations Than Excess Deaths From Cases Of COVID-19. MILLER-MEEKS: “I think that one of the costs of the pandemic and how we’ve responded to the pandemic -- I’ve addressed with Dr. Walensky and Dr Fauci and the subcommittee and the coronavirus task force -- is the number of excess deaths. We now know the number of excess deaths from how we handled COVID-19 with lockdowns, isolation, and banning social gatherings, that that has led to excess deaths which are now in excess of what has happened from COVID19 - - if in fact all deaths were COVID-19 and not somebody hospitalized with COVID-19.” [YouTube, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks M.D., 12/2/21] (VIDEO) 00:02:47

Miller-Meeks Compared 277 COVID-19 Deaths In Children To Child Death Tolls From Influenza, H1N1, And Drowning. ‘COVID-19 deaths in children were 277 through the end of April. To put this in perspective, the CDC estimates around 600 children died of influenza in 2017-2018 season, 358 died during the 2009 H1N1 pandemic and each year, more than 700 children die from drowning. We can see the light at the end of this pandemic tunnel, and as the number of Americans who are vaccinated continues to grow, coupled with those who have natural immunity from having the disease, I expect to see a return to normalcy and return to a pre-pandemic life.’ [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 5/12/21] (VIDEO)

Cedar Rapids Gazette Gave Miller-Meeks’ Debate Claim That Early COVID-19 Pandemic Shutdowns Had Caused 98,000 Deaths Unrelated To Covid-19 From Limited Hospital Services A ‘C’ Rating. ‘In this check, we'll hit on two debate claims from Miller-Meeks, an ophthalmologist and state senator. Claim 1: 'The CDC has already said over 98,000 people had non-COVID related deaths because of hospitals that were closed down for non-essential services,' Miller-Meeks said as an example of a side effect of shutdowns in the early months of the pandemic. It seems like it would be easy enough to check her statement. After all, she said she got the information from the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. However, the Miller-Meeks campaign did not respond to the Fact Checker's request for its sourcing, so we had to guess what research she was referencing. […] It's possible some of these excess deaths were due to shutdowns of non-emergency procedures, as Miller-Meeks said, but it's also possible there were other reasons — like people deciding not to seek care because they feared contracting the disease. But emergency rooms didn't close. Grade: Miller-Meeks said more than 98,000 Americans died 'because hospitals were closed down for non-essential services,' but the reasons for these excess deaths haven't been confirmed by the research by the CDC or other organizations. The number she cited is through early October, while medical services shutdowns were shorter. We give her a C.’ [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 10/26/20]

Miller-Meeks Flip-Flopped On Economic Relief During The COVID-19 Pandemic And Voted Against The American Rescue Plan, Which She Called “Only Tangentially Related To The COVID Pandemic”

Weeks Before The 2020 Election, Miller Meeks Called For Another Round Of Direct Stimulus Payments And An Extension Of Unemployment Insurance…
October 2020: Miller-Meeks said Congress needed to act quickly on a bipartisan solution to provide another wave of COVID-19 relief including additional unemployment benefits. “Miller-Meeks, in last week's Quad-City Times/KWQC TV6 debate, agreed that Congress needs to act quickly on a bipartisan solution to provide another wave of coronavirus relief, including additional unemployment benefits. On immigration reform, Hart said she supports a strong southern border, but that Congress must craft humanitarian immigration reform that recognizes immigrants are an important part of growing Iowa's economy and filling workforce gaps.” [Quad-City Times, 10/22/20]

September 2020: Miller-Meeks said she supported a second round of pandemic stimulus checks and unemployment insurance increases reflecting ongoing negotiations. “Second pandemic stimulus: Both candidates supported a second round of stimulus checks to be issued, supporting the millions of people out of work during the coronavirus pandemic, as well as the increased unemployment benefits. Miller-Meeks said the amount of that increase should reflect ongoing negotiations.” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 9/25/20]

October 2020: Miller-Meeks called the hiatus in negotiations over another relief package “disappointing.” “As the debate largely centered on the pandemic, the two agreed that Congress should take swift action to reach bipartisan solutions. Negotiations on more government aid have stalled in Congress as President Donald Trump waffles on pressing the legislative branch to pass a relief package. Trump had tweeted Tuesday that he 'instructed my representatives to stop negotiating until after the election,' though hours later, he urged Congress to pass a new relief bill. [...] Miller-Meeks agreed that the hiatus in negotiations over another relief package was 'disappointing,' especially seeing firsthand the struggling individuals and small businesses in her town. Another bill should provide additional Paycheck Protection Program funds, address unemployment and facilitate Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program benefits - popularly known as food stamps - to help those with food insecurity, Miller-Meeks said. She touted Iowa's 'conservative fiscal practices’ as helping the state better brace for the pandemic than other states, taking aim at three states under Democratic control. ‘You can't expect the taxpayers of Iowa to bailout Illinois or New York or California for their poor fiscal practices,’ Miller-Meeks said.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 10/8/20]

... But once Biden was president, Miller-Meeks flip-flopped on considering direct payments, and repeatedly claimed unemployment insurance was discouraging work

January 2021: Miller-Meeks said she thought it was too soon to consider another round of direct payments for COVID-19 relief. “Before Trump left office, he put pressure on Congress to approve another COVID-19 stimulus package that includes $2,000 direct payments to Americans. The $900 billion package that Congress approved and Trump signed only included $600 direct payments, and Biden has since pledged to advocate for another round of direct payments. Axne, Iowa’s lone Democratic representative, said Congress needs to approve another stimulus bill because, she said, food banks are overloaded, some people are only working part-time, and some people haven’t applied for unemployment. ‘To me this is a no brainer, and it’s really unfortunate that my colleagues can’t see that people are suffering in our own backyard,’ Axne said. She said passing more relief is a priority this year, and she’s working on allocating $100 million to support broadband capabilities nationwide. She also listed support for schools reopening and the health care industry. Miller-Meeks and Hinson both said they think it’s too soon to start thinking about another round of direct payments when we haven’t seen the full economic effects of the last stimulus package. ‘I don’t want to hamper our economic recovery by going too big of a package at the wrong time,’ Miller-Meeks said.” [Daily Iowan, 1/24/21]

Miller-Meeks: “Currently about 40 percent of workers on enhanced unemployment are paid more than they did while they were working; coincidentally there is a labor shortage.” “MILLER-MEEKS: Thank you and currently about 40 percent of workers on enhanced unemployment are paid more than they did while they were working; coincidentally there is a labor shortage. In my home state of Iowa, as of May 2021, 87,000 workers dropped out of the labor force since February 2020, a 5 percent decrease in the size of Iowa's workforce notwithstanding employers in my state cannot find workers and these are jobs that are greater than $15 an hour; even some employers cannot find people to work at salaries of between $80,000 and $130,000. As Governor Brainard pointed out earlier this year, true unemployment is far higher than the headline rate and the labor force
Participation rate is nearly 6 percentage points below where it was at the beginning of the 21st century. Shouldn't we be doing everything we can to incentivize work for our citizens and shouldn't we be looking at bringing in additional unskilled workers into this country at a time when we have a labor shortage of skilled workers?” [CQ, 6/22/21]

Miller-Meeks: “We Need To Get Rid Of The Pandemic Emergency Measures That Were Put In Place, And That Were Just Passed In January, That Had Increased Enhanced Federal Unemployment Benefits.” “On the subject of the current labor shortage, Representative Miller-Meeks said. ‘Right now, we are seeing there’s a huge demand for labor. And we can’t get labor and people into the workforce. And I’m not talking about jobs that pay $7.25 an hour; I don’t even know of a job, even if that’s the federal minimum wage, I don’t know of any employer that’s paying that. They’re all paying much more than that. And to get workers at $16 to $20 an hour and even, I’ve talked to some employers, to get people to come in to jobs that are 80 to 130 thousand a year, or they’re having difficulty. So we need to get rid of the pandemic emergency measures that were put in place, and that were just passed in January, that had increased enhanced federal unemployment benefits. We need to relinquish that so we can get people back in the workplace.”” [Oskaloosa News, 5/31/21]

**Miller-Meeks Supported Iowa Ending Participation In Pandemic UI**

Miller-Meeks “Fully Support[ed]” Gov. Reynolds’ Decision To End Iowa’s Participation In Federal Pandemic-Related Unemployment Benefits. “I fully support @IAGovernor's decision. Iowa has been leading the way for months by getting our kids back in school, reopening our businesses, and putting our economy back on track.” QUOTE TWEET @IAGovernor: “Iowa will end its participation in federal pandemic-related unemployment benefit programs. Our unemployment rate is at 3.7 percent, vaccines are available to anyone who wants one, and we have more jobs available than unemployed people. (1/2)” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 5/11/21]

**Miller-Meeks Voted Against And Repeatedly Attacked The American Rescue Plan (ARP)**

March 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Concurring In The Senate Amendment To The American Rescue Plan Act. In March 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against: “Yarmuth, D-Ky., motion to concur in the Senate amendment to the bill comprising a $1.9 trillion coronavirus relief package to further address the health and economic effects of COVID-19, including approximately $362 billion in direct aid to state and local governments; $47.8 billion for testing and contact tracing; $168 billion to assist educational institutions; and $53.6 billion to assist small businesses. It would extend federal unemployment compensation benefits through Sept. 6, 2021; provide tax rebates of $1,400 for individuals with incomes of $75,000 or less; and extend or expand a number of employer and individual tax credits, including credits to subsidize health insurance premiums. The bill would provide direct assistance of $195.3 billion for states and $130.2 billion for local governments, as well as $10 billion for grants to states to support capital projects, such as broadband access. It would provide $122.8 billion for an Education Department elementary and secondary school emergency relief fund; $39.6 billion for grants to higher education institutions; $3 billion for education programs for individuals with disabilities and $2.75 billion for non-public schools. It would provide $39 billion for child care block grants to states. It would provide $27.8 billion for emergency rental assistance and housing vouchers. $10 billion for homeownership assistance and $5 billion for assistance to individuals experiencing homelessness. It would continue the 15% increase in Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program benefits through September 2021. It would provide over $92 billion for the Health and Human Services Department, including $47.8 billion for COVID-19 testing and contact tracing; $7.5 billion for vaccine administration and distribution; $6.1 billion for vaccine and therapeutic development, manufacturing and procurement; $7.6 billion to expand the public health workforce; $7.6 billion for community health centers; $6.1 billion for Native American health programs; and $3 billion for substance abuse and mental health block grant programs. It would provide $50 billion for the Federal Emergency Management Agency disaster relief fund; $14.5 billion for veterans’ health care services; $10 billion for emergency medical supply production under the Defense Production Act; $8.7 billion for COVID-19 health response efforts overseas; and $200 million for Labor Department worker protection activities, including at least half for the Occupational Safety and Health Administration. It would extend federal unemployment compensation benefits of $300 per week through Sep. 6,
February 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Passage Of The American Rescue Plan Act. In February 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against: “Passage of the fiscal 2021 budget reconciliation bill, as amended, comprising a coronavirus relief package that would provide roughly $1.9 trillion in funding to further address the health and economic effects of COVID-19, including approximately $350 billion in direct aid to state and local governments; $47.8 billion for testing and contact tracing; $168 billion to assist educational institutions; and $50 billion to assist small businesses. It would extend and increase federal unemployment compensation benefits for 24 weeks and increase the weekly amount to $400; provide tax rebates of $1,400 for individuals with incomes of $75,000 or less; extend or expand a number of employer and individual tax credits, including credits to subsidize health insurance premiums; and gradually increase the federal minimum wage to $15 per hour. Among other provisions, the bill would provide $195.3 billion for direct assistance to states and $130.2 billion for local governments; $128.6 billion through fiscal 2023 for an Education Department elementary and secondary school emergency relief fund and $39.6 billion for grants to higher education institutions, including to provide emergency financial aid; and continue the 15% increase in Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program benefits through September 2021. It would provide $47.8 billion for COVID-19 testing and contact tracing; $7.5 billion for vaccine administration and distribution; and $6.1 billion for vaccine and therapeutic development, manufacturing and procurement. It would require Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program to fully cover the cost of COVID-19 vaccines. It would expand eligibility in 2021 and 2022 for federal tax subsidies toward Affordable Care Act marketplace insurance premiums, including to fully cover premium costs for individuals earning up to 150% of the federal poverty level and cap premiums at 8.5% of household income. It would provide additional financial aid for state and local governments; $50 billion to assist small businesses; $50 billion for餐厅 assistance, including $25 billion for restaurants; $18 billion for airline and aviation industries; and $130 billion for state and local governments; and continue the 15% increase in Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program benefits through September 2021. It would provide $50 billion for small business assistance, including $28.6 billion for restaurants and $7.25 billion for the Paycheck Protection Program. It would provide $4 billion for Agriculture Department pandemic-related assistance.” The motion was agreed to by a vote of 220-211. [HR 1319, Vote #72, 3/10/21; CQ, 3/10/21]

February 2021: Miller-Meeks Said She Voted Against The American Rescue Plan Because Its Provisions Were “Only Tangentially Related To The COVID Pandemic.” “Today, February 27th, 2021, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02) released the following statement after voting NO on H.R. 1319, the budget reconciliation package: ‘I am disappointed that all Republican amendments, including Rep. Feenstra’s bipartisan derecho disaster relief amendment, were blocked from this $1.9 trillion bill. With almost $1 trillion of previous bipartisan funding packages remaining unspent and now over a trillion in new funds only tangentially related to the COVID pandemic; it is unacceptable that less than 1/2 of 1% of the total funds in this bill will go to fund local and state public health workers. Additionally, roughly 9% of the funds are going to vaccines, testing, and contact tracing, which is simply not enough. Across Iowa’s 99 counties, local public health officials are intelligent, experienced, and capable to dispense vaccines in a rapid and efficient process. Acknowledging the tremendous work that our state and local public health workforce does on a daily basis and FUNDING their efforts directly down to the community level with non-competitive local public health grants will go a long way towards defeating this virus and get America back on its feet.’” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 2/27/21]
• Miller-Meeks Criticized The American Rescue Plan (ARP), Claiming “Less Than One Half Of The Total $1.9 Trillion Funding Went To Public Health Workforce.” “MILLER-MEEKS: “And in fact, I spoke on the floor of Congress in criticism of the latest COVID relief bill that passed because less than one half of 1% of the total $1.9 trillion funding went to public health workforce, and it could have gone to public health workforce and non-competitive grants to local public health workforce, of which in Iowa there are 101 local public health workforces, county departments who did amazing work during the pandemic.” [YouTube, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 9/30/21] (VIDEO) 00:00:15

The American Rescue Plan Act Provided $1,400 Direct Payments, Aid To State And Local Governments, Schools, And Small Businesses, An Expanded Child Tax Credit, And Vaccine Distribution Funds

The American Rescue Plan Act Provided $1,400 Direct Payments, Aid To State And Local Governments, Schools, And Small Businesses, An Expanded Child Tax Credit, And Vaccine Distribution Funds. “President Biden signed the $1.9 trillion American Rescue Plan Act into law on Thursday, finalizing an early policy victory that will send much-needed aid to millions of Americans still struggling from the COVID-19 pandemic. […] The American Rescue Plan provides $1,400 direct payments to individuals making up to $75,000 annually, $350 billion in aid to state and local governments and $14 billion for vaccine distribution. The bill also provides $130 billion to elementary, middle and high schools to assist with safe reopening. […] It includes an additional $300 billion in weekly jobless benefits through September and an expanded tax credit of up to $3,600 per child, initially distributed in monthly installments. The child tax credit could raise 4 million children out of poverty, according to an analysis by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. More than $50 billion will be distributed to small businesses, including $7 billion for the Paycheck Protection Program. The bill also provides $25 billion for relief for small and mid-sized restaurants, which have suffered significantly during the pandemic.” [CBS News, 3/12/21]

Iowans Received $3.9 Billion In Third Round Economic Impact Payments Through ARP

Individuals In Iowa Received $3.9 Billion In Third Round Economic Impact Payments Of Up To $1,400 Through The American Rescue Plan. Iowa received $3.904 billion in Third Round Economic Impact Payments through The American Rescue Plan Act: “The U.S. Department of the Treasury and the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) released state-by-state data through early June for the 163.5 million Economic Impact Payments (EIPs) totaling nearly $390 billion received by individuals through the American Rescue Plan Act. With this round of payments, the IRS and the Bureau of the Fiscal Service (BFS) have delivered more EIPs and more total direct relief than in any previous round of direct relief. All 50 states saw more total relief with this round of payments than in previous rounds. […] The EIPs under the American Rescue Plan included payments of up to $1,400 per qualifying dependent, a significant increase over the $500 and $600 per qualifying child from the first and second rounds of payments, respectively.” [Department of the Treasury, Press Release, 6/29/21]

Individuals In Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District Received $37.7 Million In Child Tax Credit Payments, And Iowans Received $157 Million Statewide

According To Estimates From The Joint Economic Committee Made Using State-Level Data From The Treasury, Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District Had Received $37.7 Million In Child Tax Credit Payments As Of August 2021. According to estimates from the Joint Economic Committee, Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District had received $37.7 million in Child Tax Credit payments as of August 2021: “Using state-level data from the Treasury Department on advance Child Tax Credit (CTC) payments, the Joint Economic Committee estimated the number of qualifying children, total number of payments, and total payment amount by congressional district in August 2021, when the second round of CTC payments was distributed.” [Joint Economic Committee, 9/9/21; Joint Economic Committee, Estimates of Advance Child Tax Credit Distribution by Congressional District, 9/9/21]

• JEC Analysis Showed The CTC Had Dramatically Reduced Food Insecurity And Financial Hardship, And Was Expected To Inject Nearly $19.3 Billion Into Local Economies Each Month. “JEC analysis of data from the Census Bureau showed the expanded CTC is already having a major impact on family budgets, with
dramatic declines in food insufficiency and financial hardship, and the JEC estimates that monthly CTC payments will inject nearly $19.3 billion into local economies each month. The expanded CTC will generate nearly $19.3 billion in spending in local economies across the U.S. each month. Family finances improved significantly following the first monthly expanded CTC payments in July. Data from the Census Bureau show that following the July payments, there were significant declines in the share of households with children reporting financial hardship and food insufficiency. Families are using the expanded CTC payments to meet the needs of their household. Among those who responded to the Census Bureau’s survey: 47% spent their CTC payment on food, 28% spent it on internet and other utilities, 26% spent it on school expenses, and 17% of those with at least one child under age 5 spent it on child care.” [Joint Economic Committee, 9/9/21]

As Of August 2021, Iowa Had Received $157 Million In Child Tax Credit Payments As Part Of The American Rescue Plan. As of August 2021, Iowa had received $157 million in Child Tax Credit payments: “The U.S. Department of the Treasury and the Internal Revenue Service announced today that more than $15 billion were paid to families that include roughly 61 million eligible children in the second monthly payment of the expanded and newly-advanceable Child Tax Credit from the American Rescue Plan passed in March. […] Eligible families received a payment of up to $300 per month for each child under age 6 and up to $250 per month for each child age 6 to 17. This tax relief is having a real impact on the lives of America’s children. According to the Census Bureau’s Household Pulse Survey data released earlier this week, parents reported having less trouble covering the costs of food and other household expenses after receiving their first CTC payment. The share of families reporting that they sometimes or often did not have enough to eat in the past week dropped to the lowest percentage since the pandemic began. Parents are using their CTC payments to pay for basics for their kids.” [Department of the Treasury, Press Release, 8/13/21]

- **Parents Reported Having Less Trouble Covering The Costs Of Food And Other Household Expenses After Receiving Their First Child Tax Credit Payment.** “According to the Census Bureau’s Household Pulse Survey data released earlier this week, parents reported having less trouble covering the costs of food and other household expenses after receiving their first CTC payment. The share of families reporting that they sometimes or often did not have enough to eat in the past week dropped to the lowest percentage since the pandemic began. Parents are using their CTC payments to pay for basics for their kids.” [Department of the Treasury, Press Release, 8/13/21]

Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District Received $31.6 Million In Small Business Support From Restaurant Revitalization Funding Through ARP, And $122 Million Statewide

As Of August 2021, Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District Had Received $31.6 Million In Restaurant Revitalization Funding To Help Restaurants Keep Their Doors Open As Part Of The American Rescue Plan. As of August 2021, Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District had received $31.6 million in Restaurant Revitalization Funding as part of The American Rescue Plan: “The American Rescue Plan Act established the Restaurant Revitalization Fund (RRF) to provide funding to help restaurants and other eligible businesses keep their doors open. This program will provide restaurants with funding equal to their pandemic-related revenue loss up to $10 million per business and no more than $5 million per physical location. Recipients are not required to repay the funding as long as funds are used for eligible uses no later than March 11, 2023.” [U.S. Small Business Administration, RRF FOIA, 8/18/21; U.S. Small Business Administration, accessed 9/7/21]

- **As Of June 2021, Iowa Had Received $122 Million In Restaurant Revitalization Funding As Part Of The American Rescue Plan.** [U.S. Small Business Administration, RRF Report, 6/30/21]

Iowa Received $91 Million In Small Business Support From Shuttered Venues Operators Grants Through ARP To Help Live Venues, Museums, And Theaters Stay Open

As Of December 2021, Iowa Had Received $91 Million In Shuttered Venues Operators Grants To Help Live Venues, Museums, And Theaters Stay Open As Part Of The American Rescue Plan. As of December 2021,
Iowa had received $91 million in Shuttered Venues Operators Grants as part of the American Rescue Plan Act: “The Shuttered Venue Operators Grant (SVOG) program was established by the Economic Aid to Hard-Hit Small Businesses, Nonprofits, and Venues Act, and amended by the American Rescue Plan Act. The program includes over $16 billion in grants to shuttered venues, to be administered by SBA’s Office of Disaster Assistance. Eligible applicants may qualify for grants equal to 45% of their gross earned revenue, with the maximum amount available for a single grant award of $10 million. $2 billion is reserved for eligible applications with up to 50 full-time employees. […] Eligible entities include: live venue operators or promoters, theatrical producers, live performing arts organization operators, museum operators, motion picture theater operators (including owners), talent representatives.” [SBA Shuttered Venue Operators Grant Program Reports, 12/27/21; SBA accessed 9/8/21]

Iowa Received $775 Million In Small Business Support From Elementary And Secondary School Emergency Relief Through ARP To Help Safely Reopen Schools

Iowa Received $775 Million In Elementary And Secondary School Emergency Relief Through The American Rescue Plan To Help Safely Reopen Schools. Iowa received $775 million in Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief through the American Rescue Plan: “This document outlines the American Rescue Plan Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ARP ESSER) Fund under the American Rescue Plan (ARP) Act of 2021, Public Law 117-2, enacted on March 11, 2021. ARP ESSER provides a total of nearly $122 billion to States and school districts to help safely reopen and sustain the safe operation of schools and address the impact of the coronavirus pandemic on the nation’s students. In addition to ARP ESSER, the ARP Act includes $3 billion for special education, $850 million for the Outlying Areas, $2.75 billion to support non-public schools, and additional funding for homeless children and youth, Tribal educational agencies, Native Hawaiians, and Alaska Natives.” [ARP ESSER Methodology and Allocation Table Revised, 6/25/21; Department of Education, Fact Sheet, 3/17/21]

Iowa Received $1.48 Billion In Coronavirus State And Local Fiscal Recovery Funds As Part Of The American Rescue Plan To Help Governments Respond To The Pandemic And Bring Back Jobs

Iowa Received $1.48 Billion In Coronavirus State And Local Fiscal Recovery Funds As Part Of The American Rescue Plan To Help Governments Respond To The Pandemic And Bring Back Jobs. Iowa received $1.48 billion in Coronavirus State and Local Fiscal Recovery Funds as part of the American Rescue Plan: “The American Rescue Plan will deliver $350 billion for eligible state, local, territorial, and Tribal governments to respond to the COVID-19 emergency and bring back jobs. […] Recipients may use these funds to: support public health expenditures, by, for example, funding COVID-19 mitigation efforts, medical expenses, behavioral healthcare, and certain public health and safety staff, address negative economic impacts caused by the public health emergency, including economic harms to workers, households, small businesses, impacted industries, and the public sector, replace lost public sector revenue, using this funding to provide government services to the extent of the reduction in revenue experienced due to the pandemic, provide premium pay for essential workers, offering additional support to those who have and will bear the greatest health risks because of their service in critical infrastructure sectors, invest in water, sewer, and broadband infrastructure, making necessary investments to improve access to clean drinking water, support vital wastewater and stormwater infrastructure, and to expand access to broadband internet, within these overall categories, recipients have broad flexibility to decide how best to use this funding to meet the needs of their communities. [Department of the Treasury, Allocation for States, accessed 9/8/21; Department of the Treasury, accessed 9/8/21]

- The 24 Counties Comprising Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District Received $151.9 Million In Coronavirus State And Local Fiscal Recovery Funds As A Result Of The American Rescue Plan. [Department of the Treasury, May 2021]

Coronavirus State And Local Fiscal Recovery Funds – Law Enforcement

The American Rescue Plan Provided $350 Billion In State And Local Funding To Hire Law Enforcement Officials, Pay Overtime For Community Policing, And Restore Law Enforcement To Pre-Pandemic Levels.
“Today, the Treasury Department is highlighting that communities experiencing a surge in gun violence as a result of the pandemic may use the American Rescue Plan’s $350 billion in state and local funding for purposes such as: Hiring law enforcement officials – even above pre-pandemic levels – or paying overtime where the funds are directly focused on advancing community policing strategies in those communities experiencing an increase in gun violence associated with the pandemic. […] In addition, the Treasury Department is clarifying that any community may use ARP state and local aid for the above strategies and any other public safety programs, up to the level of revenue loss the jurisdiction experienced during the pandemic. And any community may use ARP funds to rehire police officers and other public servants to restore law enforcement and courts to their pre-pandemic levels.” [White House, Press Release, 6/23/21]

Department Of The Treasury: “There Are Many Ways In Which The State And Local Fiscal Recovery Funds […] Can Support Communities Working To Reduce And Respond To Increased Violence.” “Under Treasury’s Interim Final Rule, there are many ways in which the State and Local Fiscal Recovery Funds (“Funds”) under the American Rescue Plan Act can support communities working to reduce and respond to increased violence due to the pandemic. […] In all communities, recipients may use resources to rehire police officers and other public servants to restore law enforcement and courts to their pre-pandemic levels. […] In communities where an increase in violence or increased difficulty in accessing or providing services to respond to or mitigate the effects of violence, is a result of the pandemic they may use funds to address that harm. This spending may include: Hiring law enforcement officials – even above pre-pandemic levels – or paying overtime where the funds are directly focused on advancing community policing strategies in those communities experiencing an increase in gun violence associated with the pandemic o Community Violence Intervention (CVI) programs, including capacity building efforts at CVI programs like funding and training additional intervention workers.” [Department of the Treasury, 7/19/21]

Biden: “The American Rescue Plan, Which We Passed In The First 100 Days Of My Administration, Is Providing Much-Needed, Historic Relief To Bring Back Those Law Enforcement Jobs.” President Biden: “The American Rescue Plan, which we passed in the first 100 days of my administration, is providing much-needed, historic relief to bring back those law enforcement jobs and social service jobs. Much of this relief has already arrived. The rest is on its way. And we’re now providing more guidance on how they can use the $350 billion nationally that the American Rescue Plan has available to help reduce crime and address the root causes. For example, cities experiencing an increase in gun violence were able to use the American Rescue Plan dollars to hire police officers needed for community policing and to pay their overtime. Mayors will also be able to buy crime-fighting technologies, like gunshot detection systems, to better see and stop gun violence in their communities. They can use the funding to scale up wraparound services for the residents as well, including substance abuse and mental health services that we know will make a difference in prevention of crime.” [White House, 6/23/21]

Miller-Meeks Called The Eviction Moratorium “Unconstitutional” And Said It Was “Unfairly Harming Mom & Pop Property Owners.” “Props on your coverage of this horrendous execution. Meanwhile, POTUS extends an unconstitutional eviction moratorium unfairly harming mom & pop property owners who have problems paying mortgage, property taxes and upkeep.” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 8/14/21]

Miller-Meeks Said The Eviction Moratorium Hurts Small Businesses, Local Community Banks, And Renters Who “Can’t Pay Their Property Taxes Because They’ve Got No Income.” “So remember that it was the moderate Democrats who kept the progressives from being able to have an extension of the eviction moratorium. Maxine Waters and other progressive Democrats were really pushing for that issue but as we know that’s an issue that hurts mom-and-pops, it hurts our local community banks, it hurts our tax base, when the person who as a landowner, property owner, who rents out just a simple property can’t pay their property taxes because they’ve got no income.” [FOX Business, 8/21/21] (VIDEO) 00:00:42-00:01:12
October 2020: Miller-Meeks Said Another COVID-19 Economic Relief Bill Should Facilitate SNAP Benefits, Additional PPP Funds, And Address Unemployment. “As the debate largely centered on the pandemic, the two agreed that Congress should take swift action to reach bipartisan solutions. Negotiations on more government aid have stalled in Congress as President Donald Trump waffles on pressing the legislative branch to pass a relief package. Trump had tweeted Tuesday that he ‘instructed my representatives to stop negotiating until after the election,’ though hours later, he urged Congress to pass a new relief bill. […] Miller-Meeks agreed that the hiatus in negotiations over another relief package was ‘disappointing,’ especially seeing firsthand the struggling individuals and small businesses in her town. Another bill should provide additional Paycheck Protection Program funds, address unemployment and facilitate Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program benefits - popularly known as food stamps - to help those with food insecurity, Miller-Meeks said. She touted Iowa's 'conservative fiscal practices' as helping the state better brace for the pandemic than other states, taking aim at three states under Democratic control. ‘You can't expect the taxpayers of Iowa to bailout Illinois or New York or California for their poor fiscal practices,’ Miller-Meeks said.” [Iowa Starting Line, 10/8/20]

March 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted For Extending The Authorization For The Small Business Administration’s PPP Loan Program Through June 2021. In March 2021, Miller-Meeks voted for: “Velazquez, D-N.Y., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill that would extend the authorization for the Small Business Administration's Paycheck Protection Program from March 31 to June 30, 2021. It would prohibit the SBA from accepting new PPP loan applications after May 31, 2021.” The motion was agreed to by a vote of 415-3. [HR 1799, Vote #80, 3/16/21; CQ, 3/16/21]

April 2020: Miller-Meeks Said She Supported The Paycheck Protection Program And Wanted To Expand The Program For Small Businesses. At a Johnson County GOP Candidate Forum Miller-Meeks was said “So I think the payroll protection plan or the PPP needs to be expanded so that smaller businesses have more access to that funding. It’s a forgivable loan if it’s used to pay for rent or for employees in order to maintain them as employees to maintain their staff. [Johnson County GOP Candidate Forum, 00:07:34, 4/24/20] (VIDEO)

Miller-Meeks Repeatedly Refused To Wear A Mask On The House Floor And Iowa Senate Floor, Citing The False Claim That COVID-19 Was “Not Aerosolized” To Argue Going Without A Mask Was Safe

2020: Miller-Meeks Refused To Wear A Mask On The Iowa Senate Floor, Citing Blatantly False Claim That COVID Was “Not Aerosolized” To Argue Going Without A Mask Was Safe

June 2020: Miller-Meeks Refused To Wear A Mask On The Floor Of The Iowa Senate, Arguing That She Did Not Need To Wear A Mask If She Stood Six Feet Away From Her Colleagues. “Despite Miller-Meeks’ votes and statements showing otherwise, her latest ad says she ‘took COVID seriously.’ In June, when called out on the Senate floor by Sen. BillDotzler for not wearing a mask, Miller-Meeks argued she did not need to wear a mask so long as she stayed six feet apart from her colleagues. ‘Scientifically, COVID-19 … is not aerosolized, so that’s why you can have a physical separation of six feet,’ Miller-Meeks said. Airborne transmission of the coronavirus, however, has been noted throughout the pandemic as one of the primary ways the virus is spread. ‘The scientific community has been raising the alarm about this since February, that airborne spread can happen,’ Joseph Allen, a professor at the Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, told NBC News.” [Iowa Starting Line, 9/23/20]

Miller-Meeks Falsely Claimed “Scientifically, COVID-19… Is Not Aerosolized,” In Explaining Why She Did Not Need To Wear A Mask. “Despite Miller-Meeks’ votes and statements showing otherwise, her latest ad says she ‘took COVID seriously.’ In June, when called out on the Senate floor by Sen. Bill Dotzler for not wearing a mask, Miller-Meeks argued she did not need to wear a mask so long as she stayed six feet apart from her colleagues. ‘Scientifically, COVID-19 … is not aerosolized, so that’s why you can have a physical separation of six feet,’ Miller-Meeks said. Airborne transmission of the coronavirus, however, has been noted throughout the
pandemic as one of the primary ways the virus is spread. ‘The scientific community has been raising the alarm about this since February, that airborne spread can happen,’ Joseph Allen, a professor at the Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, told NBC News.” [Iowa Starting Line, 9/23/20]

2021: Miller-Meeks Was Fined $500 For Twice Violating COVID Protocols By Not Wearing A Mask On The House Floor

May 2021: Miller-Meeks Was One Of Three House Members Fined $500 By the House Ethics Committee For A Second Violation Of The House Floor Mask Mandate. “As the House finished voting on Tuesday afternoon, a group of Republicans gathered on the floor, smiled and huddled for a selfie. None wore masks. They were among about a dozen Republican lawmakers who openly defied last week’s decision by House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) to keep a mask mandate on the House floor until all lawmakers and staff are vaccinated. Now three of those GOP lawmakers — Brian Mast (Fla.), Mariannette Miller-Meeks (Iowa), a physician, and Beth Van Duyne (Tex.) — face $500 fines for breaking the rules, a Capitol official told The Washington Post. All three were fined because this was the second time they defied the mask mandate, while seven other Republicans were issued a first warning.” [Washington Post, 5/19/21]

- **Miller-Meeks On House Floor Mask Mandate:** “Nancy Pelosi Wants To Fine The Science Not Follow The Science.” “Several GOP lawmakers are risking steep penalties to go mask-less on the House floor. Congresswoman Mariannette Miller-Meeks got hit with a $500 fine for not wearing her mask on the House floor this week. ‘Nancy Pelosi wants to fine the science not follow the science,’ Rep. Miller-Meeks (R-IA) said She says she’s fully vaccinated and thinks the House rules miss the opportunity to highlight what the CDC said are the benefits of vaccination. ‘To show Americans that if you were vaccinated you can go without your mask,’ she said.” [WLS 6, 5/21/21]

- **Miller-Meeks Was One Of Eight Republican Members Who Refused To Wear A Mask That Day; Others Included Marjorie Taylor Greene, Lauren Boebert, Louie Gohmert, And Thomas Massie.** “A Capitol official told USA TODAY that three Republicans will be issued $500 fines for defying the mask rules: Reps. Brian Mast of Florida, Beth Van Duyne of Texas, and Mariannette Miller-Meeks of Iowa. Seven other Republicans will be issued warnings: Thomas Massie of Kentucky, Lauren Boebert of Colorado, Marjorie Taylor Greene of Georgia, Chip Roy of Texas, Bob Good of Virginia, Mary Miller of Illinois, and Louie Gohmert of Texas.” [USA Today, 5/19/21]

June 2021: The House Ethics Committee Upheld Its Fines Issued To Republicans Who Violated The House Floor Mask Mandate, Including Miller-Meeks. The House Ethics Committee announced Friday that it is upholding the $500 fines issued to a handful of GOP lawmakers who refused to comply with a requirement last month to wear masks on the House floor during the COVID-19 pandemic. Reps. Brian Mast (Fla.), Beth Van Duyne (Texas) and Mariannette Miller-Meeks (Iowa) were among at least six House Republicans who joined in a protest last month against the requirement that everyone wear masks in the House chamber regardless of vaccination status. [The Hill, 6/25/21]

- **HEADLINE:** “House Ethics Panel Upholds $500 Mask Fines Against GOP Lawmakers.” [The Hill, 6/25/21]

**Miller-Meeks Raised Campaign Money Off Her Fine For Not Wearing A Mask**

Miller-Meeks Tweeted A Fundraising Link About Being Fined For Violating The House Floor Mask Mandate.
As Of January 2022, Miller-Meeks’ Mask Fines Totaled $2,500

As Of January 2022, Miller-Meeks Had Been Fined $2,500 For Not Wearing A Mask On The House Floor. “Rep. Andrew Clyde (R-Ga.) has been fined at least $58,000 for repeatedly violating rules requiring lawmakers to wear masks on the House floor during the COVID-19 pandemic, while Rep. Lauren Boebert (R-Colo.) has been fined $500, the House Ethics Committee revealed Monday. The Ethics Committee further disclosed that a third Republican, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (Iowa), was also fined for not wearing a mask. […] Miller-Meeks was previously fined $500 in May for refusing to wear a mask as part of a protest among several GOP lawmakers who questioned why the House mask mandate was still in effect when the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) was advising at the time that vaccinated people didn’t need to wear them. The CDC has since rescinded that guidance following new variants that have caused breakthrough infections in vaccinated people. That means Miller-Meeks is now on the hook for a $2,500 fine, which she did not appeal.” [The Hill, 1/10/22]

2021: Miller-Meeks Refused To Speak To A Reporter At A Fundraiser Unless He Removed His Mask

Miller-Meeks Refused To Speak To A Reporter At A County Fundraiser Unless He Removed His Mask. “Political reporter Zachary Oren Smith was covering a Johnson County Republican fundraiser for the Iowa City Press-Citizen on May 5. The event brought out prominent GOP politicians from around southeast Iowa and featured former acting U.S. Attorney General Matt Whitaker, a possible future candidate for U.S. Senate. Oren Smith tweeted that he tried to ask Miller-Meeks some questions near the end of the evening, but was unsuccessful. As a doctor, Miller-Meeks should be aware that a vaccinated person may have many reasons to continue wearing a mask. She can’t be certain Oren Smith isn’t immunocompromised and doesn’t regularly interact with an immunocompromised person. Given recent polling on vaccine hesitancy among Iowa Republicans, there were probably quite a few unvaccinated people at the Johnson County GOP event.” [Bleeding Heartland, 5/6/21]

- Reporter Zachary Oren Smith: Miller-Meeks “Explained She Wouldn’t Talk To Me Unless I Took My Mask Off As We Were Both Vaccinated.” “Some color: I've been trying to get Miller-Meeks in to update Iowa City readers on work in DC for some time. Bumped into her at the end of the night, and she explained she wouldn't talk to me unless I took my mask off as we were both vaccinated. Didn't get my interview.” [Twitter, @ZacharyOS, 5/5/21]
• HEADLINE: “Mariannette Miller-Meeks Refuses Interview With Masked Reporter.” [Bleeding Heartland, 5/6/21]

**Miller-Meeks Opposed Federal Mask Mandates**

Miller-Meeks: “Don’t Force Mask Mandates On Everyone Who Is Vaccinated. That Makes Absolutely No Sense.” “Dr. Miller-Meeks had this to say, ‘I am very concerned about what the CDC is doing now. I think that this guidance, number one, the guidance was slow to begin with as far as removing masks, if you were fully vaccinated, I firmly believe that the vaccines work, that they’re effective, I believe the science behind the vaccine. And so if your double vaccinated, leave that to individuals to determine, given their personal health history and their personal medical risk, to wear a mask if they’re concerned or anxious about catching the Delta variant or the lambda variant that is coming up from South America. But don’t force mask mandates on everyone who is vaccinated. That makes absolutely no sense. And I’ve yet to see that data. So if I have the opportunity and I think I will speak with members of the Doc caucus to send a letter to Dr. Walensky at the CDC asking for the research and the studies that in fact support going and recommending masks on people that are double vaccinated.”’ [Fox News Radio, 7/28/21] (AUDIO)

Miller-Meeks Said She Opposed A Federal Mask Mandate But Said “I Think That Role-Modeling, That Guidance Needed To Be More Clear.” “Turning to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, Miller-Meeks said she opposes a federal mask mandate. ‘But I certainly think our communication with individuals, that wearing a mask can help protect other people and can help protect you,’ she said. ‘I think that role-modeling, that guidance needed to be more clear. And early in the pandemic, there was confusion. ... Nonetheless, that guidance needed to be more clear, more emphasized and supported.’” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 9/25/20]

• October 2020: Cedar Rapids Gazette: Miller-Meeks “Had Doubts About How To Enforce A Mandate And Whether To Fine Or Arrest Individuals Not Wearing Masks.” “On the issue of whether a mask mandate is needed, Miller-Meeks said she practices social distancing, wears a mask in public and sanitizes her hands - though she thinks others shouldn't be forced to do the same. 'I think those simple things all of us can do to make it better for everyone else,’ she said, but she had doubts about how to enforce a mandate and whether to fine or arrest individuals not wearing masks.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 10/8/20]

**Miller-Meeks Flip-Flopped On Abortion**

May 2018: Miller-Meeks Said “I’m Also Catholic, I Am Pro-Choice, But It’s A Very Sensitive Issue”

Miller-Meeks: “It’s Difficult As A Woman To Face This Issue. I’m Also Catholic, I Am Pro-Choice, But It’s A Very Sensitive Issue”

Miller-Meeks Said Abortion Discussions Were Best Left To Providers, Doctors, And Patients. At a forum hosted by Ottumwa Women’s League of Voter, Miller-Meeks said “I think these are decisions that are best left to providers, to doctors and to patients. I don’t want the government in my health care decisions. And I think that

Miller-Meeks Said Abortion Discussions Were Best Left To Providers, Doctors, And Patients. At a forum hosted by Ottumwa Women’s League of Voter, Miller-Meeks said “I think these are decisions that are best left to providers, to doctors and to patients. I don’t want the government in my health care decisions. And I think that
that’s why it’s a good thing to bring it up and to be challenged. But it is a very personal issue.” [Ottumwa League Of Women Voters, 5/31/18] (VIDEO) 00:01:21

May 2020: Miller-Meeks Said She “Misspoke” When She Called Herself Pro-Choice In 2018, Claiming “My Record Is 100 Percent Pro-Life”

May 2020: Miller-Meeks Said She Had Misspoken When She Called Herself Pro-Choice In 2018

May 2020: Miller-Meeks Said She Had Misspoken When She Called Herself Pro-Choice In 2018, Claiming “My Record Is 100 Percent Pro-Life.” “When challenged by Schilling on her stance on abortion, Miller-Meeks said she ‘misspoke’ in 2018 when she said she was pro-choice. ‘I have always been pro-life; my stance has been the same,’ she said. ‘I misspoke. It’s regrettable because it allows an avenue for people to be confused about my position. But my voting record is quite clear; we had a vote on a pro-life amendment in 2019 and 2020. I was the only woman to stand up and speak in favor of that bill. My record is 100 percent pro-life.’” [Muscatine Journal, 5/27/20]

May 2020: Miller-Meeks Said She Had A “100% Pro-Life Voting Record”

May 2020: Miller-Meeks Said She Had A “100% Pro-Life Voting Record.” “Now Miller-Meeks is ‘the only reliable pro-Trump conservative’ with a ‘100% pro-life voting record,’ she says. Schilling disputes that, backed by video clips and social media posts. The Schilling campaign released a screenshot from Miller-Meeks’ Twitter where she calls both Trump and Clinton ‘liars & corrupt.’ She was right, of course, but has since backtracked. Schilling also is promoting a video published by the Press-Citizen, in which Miller-Meeks in 2018 called herself ‘pro-choice.’ ‘I don’t want the government in my health care decisions,’ Miller-Meeks said in the video, recorded at an Ottumwa League of Women Voters forum. Again, she took the correct position in my view, but later said she misspoke.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, Adam Sullivan Column, 5/31/20]

May 2020: Miller-Meeks’ Campaign Spokesperson Claimed Miller-Meeks Had Misspoken When She Called Herself Pro-Choice In 2018

Miller-Meeks’ Campaign Spokesperson Said Miller-Meeks Having The Thought That “Some Notable Catholic Elected Leaders Are Pro-Choice” Had “Prompted Her To Misspeak.” “Her campaign spokesman, Eric Woolson, last week said Miller-Meeks simply misspoke at that event two years ago. ‘Senator Miller-Meeks was speaking to the point that she is a pro-life Catholic when it came to her mind that some notable Catholic elected leaders are pro-choice. That prompted her to misspeak,’ Woolson said. ‘As a physician, she was emphasizing her belief that, regardless of the medical condition being discussed, doctor-patient conversations need to be private and free of government intervention. All doctor-patient dialogue is, and should remain, private.’” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 5/2/20]

Miller-Meeks’ Campaign Spokesperson Said Miller-Meeks Had Been Emphasizing That “Doctor-Patient Conversations Need To Be Private And Free Of Government Intervention.” “That prompted her to misspeak “Her campaign spokesman, Eric Woolson, last week said Miller-Meeks simply misspoke at that event two years ago. […] ‘As a physician, she was emphasizing her belief that, regardless of the medical condition being discussed, doctor-patient conversations need to be private and free of government intervention. All doctor-patient dialogue is, and should remain, private.’” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 5/2/20]

Iowa City Press-Citizen: Miller-Meeks’ 2020 Anti-Abortion Stance Was “Seemingly A Shift From 2018”

Iowa City Press-Citizen: Miller-Meeks’ 2020 Anti-Abortion Stance Was “Seemingly A Shift From 2018.” “State Sen. Mariannette Miller-Meeks of Ottumwa has run her 2020 campaign for Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District as an anti-abortion candidate, seemingly a shift from 2018, when she characterized her views as ‘pro-choice’ and
said a person’s choice to get an abortion is ‘best left to doctors, to providers and to patients.’” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 5/2/20]

May 2020: Cedar Rapids Gazette Columnist Adam Sullivan Questioned Whether Miller-Meeks Was Being Honest With Voters On Abortion

Cedar Rapids Gazette Columnist Adam Sullivan On Miller-Meeks And Her Primary Opponent Bobby Schilling: “I Wonder If They’re Being Honest With Voters” On Abortion. “Abortion has been a top issue in the primary. It’s a peculiar thing for candidates to say they are ‘100 percent pro-Trump’ and also ‘100 percent pro-life,’ since Trump spent most of his life proudly supporting abortion rights. It’s not my position, but you would think a true anti-abortion champion would be committing to hold Trump accountable, not swearing blind allegiance. I don’t fault them for being moderates, either formerly or secretly. I certainly wouldn’t hold it against them if they hold nuanced views about Trump and abortion rights. But I wonder if they’re being honest with voters. And I wonder what their race to the bottom says about the state of our Republican Party.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, Adam Sullivan Column, 5/31/20]

June 2020: Miller-Meeks’ Primary Opponent Said His Campaign Got Miller-Meeks To “Embrace A More Pro-Life Position” Which He Considered “A Win”


Iowa City Press-Citizen: The 2020 Republican Primary In Iowa’s 2nd District Was A Fight “Over Who The Most Anti-Abortion Candidate Was And Who The Bigger Supporter Of President Donald Trump Was.” “The Republican primary was marked by a back-and-forth volley, as Miller-Meeks and Schilling fought over who the most anti-abortion candidate was and who the bigger supporter of President Donald Trump was. In a news conference before the results were counted, Miller-Meeks said that although it was a tough primary, it made her ‘battle-tested.’” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 6/3/20]

October 2020: In A Debate With Rita Hart, Miller-Meeks Did Not Say Whether She Favored Congress Legislating Abortion

October 2020: In A Debate With Rita Hart, Miller-Meeks Did Not Say Whether She Favored Congress Legislating Abortion. “Candidates running for Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District found some common ground during a televised debate Thursday, but continued to spar over health care. Democrat Rita Hart and Republican Mariannette Miller-Meeks met in Davenport for a debate hosted by the Quad-City Times and KWQC TV6. […] On abortion, when asked if Roe v. Wade should be overturned by the U.S. Supreme Court, Hart, a farmer and 20-year teacher, said ‘we have got to make sure that women have a right to privacy and that they have a right to reproductive health care.’ Miller-Meeks did not say whether she favors Congress stepping in to avoid a national patchwork of abortion laws.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 10/15/20]

2008: Miller-Meeks Said There Was Nothing She Could Do To Stop Abortion, Was Accused By Her Primary Opponents Of Being Liberal In Her Views On Abortion

2008: Miller-Meeks Was Accused Of Being Liberal On Abortion By A Primary Opponent. “One Republican opponent accuses Miller-Meeks of being liberal in her views on abortion, but for Miller-Meeks it comes down to an issue of education. ‘I feel that people should have access to information, which includes abstinence and other means
of birth control,’’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘‘Not every person is blessed to have a mom and a dad who are trying to help them to problem solve and resist peer pressure.’’” [The Hawk Eye, 5/27/08]

2008: Miller-Meeks Said Abortion Was A Judicial Issue And There Was Nothing She Could Do To Stop Abortion As A Lawmaker. “Miller-Meeks said because it’s a judicial issue there is nothing she can do as a lawmaker to stop abortion, but she can make it easier to support families.” [The Hawk Eye, 5/27/08]

**Miller-Meeks Made False Claims About Abortion Access Under Roe V. Wade**

**Miller-Meeks Falsely Claimed Roe V. Wade Permitted Abortion On Demand Up To Birth**

Miller-Meeks And Susan B. Anthony List President Marjorie Dannenfelser Op-Ed: Roe V. Wade “Permit[ted] Abortion On Demand Up To Birth.” “Many Americans are horrified when they learn that Roe v. Wade permits abortion on demand up to birth – instead, laws must restrict the practice. Indeed, the U.S. is one of only seven nations that permit late-term abortions for any reason more than halfway through pregnancy, a shameful group that includes North Korea and China.” [Des Moines Register, Marjorie Dannenfelser And Mariannette Miller-Meeks Op-Ed, 6/4/21]

**Roe v. Wade Allowed States To Ban Abortion After The Point Of Fetal Viability, Prevented Abortion Bans Before Viability.** “In 1973, in Roe v. Wade, the Supreme Court drew a line. The Constitution, it said, did not allow states to ban abortions before the fetus could survive outside the womb. On Wednesday, when the court hears the most important abortion case in a generation, a central question will be whether the court’s conservative majority is prepared to erase that line. The case concerns a Mississippi law that bans most abortions after 15 weeks, long before fetal viability. The court could overrule Roe entirely, allowing states to ban abortions at any point. But at least some justices may want to find a way to sustain the Mississippi law without overturning Roe in so many words, requiring them to discard the viability line and replace it with another standard that would allow a cutoff at 15 weeks.” [New York Times, 11/28/21]

**Roe v. Wade Allowed States To Prohibit Abortion After The Point Of Fetal Viability, With Only Limited Exceptions.** “In its landmark 1973 abortion cases, the U.S. Supreme Court recognized a constitutional right to abortion but held that states could prohibit abortion after fetal viability—the point at which a fetus can sustain life outside the uterus—if their policies met certain requirements. Since then, the Supreme Court has consistently reaffirmed the fundamental right to abortion while also allowing new limits on an individual’s ability to obtain one. However, after President Trump appointed three conservative justices, the Court now has an anti-abortion majority. The current U.S. Supreme Court standard holds that states may prohibit abortion after fetal viability as long as there are exceptions for the life and health (both physical and mental) of the pregnant person.” [Guttmacher Institute, updated 12/1/21]

**Miller-Meeks Urged The Supreme Court To Overturn Roe v. Wade By Upholding Mississippi’s 15-Week Abortion Ban**

December 2021: Miller-Meeks Tweeted That She Was “Proud To Stand For Life” In Front Of The Supreme Court During Oral Argument On The Mississippi 15-Week Abortion Ban

December 1, 2021: Miller-Meeks Tweeted “Proud To Stand For Life Today And Every Day! #ProLife #SCOTUS” From Outside The Supreme Court. “Proud to stand for life today and every day! #ProLife #SCOTUS” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 12/1/21]
December 1, 2021: The Supreme Court Heard Oral Argument On The Mississippi 15-Week Abortion Ban, A Case With Which The Supreme Court Was Speculated To Overturn Roe V. Wade. “Conservative U.S. Supreme Court justices on Wednesday signaled a willingness to dramatically curtail abortion rights in America and perhaps overturn the landmark 1973 Roe v. Wade ruling that legalized the procedure nationwide as they indicated they would uphold a restrictive Republican-backed Mississippi law. The court, which has a 6-3 conservative majority, heard about two hours of oral arguments in the southern state’s bid to revive its ban on abortion starting at 15 weeks of pregnancy, a law blocked by lower courts. The liberal justices warned against ditching important and longstanding legal precedents like Roe and abandoning a right American women have come to rely upon. Jackson Women’s Health Organization, the only abortion clinic in Mississippi, challenged the law and has the support of Democratic President Joe Biden’s administration. A ruling is expected by the end of next June.” [AP, 12/1/21]

July 2021: Miller-Meeks Joined An Amicus Brief Urging The Supreme Court To Overturn Roe V. Wade In The Mississippi 15-Week Abortion Ban Case

Miller-Meeks Joined An Amicus Brief Urging The Supreme Court To Overturn Roe V. Wade In A Case Reviewing Mississippi’s Abortion Law. “The Mississippi congressional delegation and the House Pro-Life Caucus today led more than 200 members of Congress in filing an amicus brief supporting the State of Mississippi in Dobbs v. Jackson Women’s Health Organization and urging the U.S. Supreme Court to uphold Mississippi’s law protecting life. […] This fall, the Supreme Court will hear Dobbs v. Jackson Women’s Health to consider the question of whether all pre-viability prohibitions on elective abortions are unconstitutional. This case represents the most significant challenge to Roe v. Wade and the viability standard in Planned Parenthood v. Casey in a generation. The State of Mississippi filed its case with the Supreme Court on July 22, 2021. […] Mariannette J. Miller-Meeks (Iowa-02)” [Office Of Sen. Roger Wicker, Press Release, 7/29/21]

September 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Women’s Health Protection Act, Which Would Codify Roe V. Wade
September 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Women’s Health Protection Act, A Bill Establishing Rights For Health Care Providers To Provide And Patients To Receive Abortions. On September 24, 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against the “Passage of the bill that would statutorily establish that health care providers have a right to provide and patients have a right to receive abortion services, and it would prohibit certain restrictions related to abortion services. The bill would specify that rights established by the bill may not be restricted by certain requirements or limitations related to abortion services, including prohibitions on abortion prior to fetal viability, or after fetal viability if a provider determines that continuation of a pregnancy would pose a risk to a patient’s life or health; requirements that patients disclose reasons for seeking an abortion or make medically unnecessary in-person appointments; requirements that providers provide medically inaccurate information or perform specific medical tests or procedures in connection with the provision of abortion services; limitations on providers’ ability to prescribe drugs based on good-faith medical judgment, provide services via telemedicine or provide immediate services when a delay would pose a risk to a patient’s health; and requirements for facilities and personnel that would not apply to facilities providing medically comparable procedures. It would also prohibit requirements or limitations that are similar to those established by the bill or that impede access to abortion services and expressly or implicitly single out abortion services, providers or facilities. It would specify factors that courts may consider to determine whether a requirement or limitation impedes access to abortion services, including whether it interferes with providers’ ability to provide services; poses a risk to patients’ health; is likely to delay or deter patients in accessing services or necessitate in-person visits that would not otherwise be required; is likely to result in a decreased availability of services in a state or region; is likely to result in increased costs of providing or obtaining services; or imposes penalties that are not imposed on other health care providers for comparable conduct. It would require a party defending a requirement or limitation to establish that it significantly advances the safety of abortion services or patient health and that such goals cannot be advanced by a less restrictive alternative measure. It would authorize the Justice Department, health care providers and private individuals and entities to bring a civil action in U.S. district court for injunctive relief against any state or government official charged with implementing or enforcing a requirement or limitation challenged as a violation of rights established by the bill. It would authorize district courts to award appropriate equitable relief, including temporary, preliminary or permanent injunctive relief, and to award costs of litigation to a prevailing plaintiff. It would require courts to ‘liberally construe’ provisions of the bill to effectuate its purposes.” The bill passed by a vote of 218-211. [CQ, 9/24/21; HR 3755, Vote 295, 9/24/21]

- **Washington Post: The Women’s Health Protection Act “Would Essentially Codify Roe V. Wade.”** “The House on Friday passed legislation that would create a statutory right for health-care professionals to provide abortions, amid an intensifying legal battle over a Texas law that is the most restrictive in the nation. H.R. 3755, the Women’s Health Protection Act, was approved by the House 218 to 211 but faces tough odds in the evenly divided Senate. The measure states that health-care providers have a statutory right to provide, and patients have a right to receive, abortion services without any number of limitations that states and opponents of the procedure have sought to impose. The measure would essentially codify Roe v. Wade, the 1973 Supreme Court decision guaranteeing the right to abortion before viability, usually around 22 to 24 weeks.” [Washington Post, 9/24/21]

- **Passage Of The WHPA Was In Response To A Restrictive Texas Abortion Law.** “Passage of the Women’s Health Protection Act is a response to a Texas law that essentially bans abortion after six weeks, before most people realize they are pregnant. The U.S. Supreme Court refused to block the law from taking effect, although the decision leaves the door open for future challenges.” [NPR, 9/24/21]

- **Pelosi: “This Ban Necessitates Codifying Roe V. Wade.”** “In a statement, Pelosi said the Texas statute is ‘the most extreme, dangerous abortion ban in half a century, and its purpose is to destroy Roe v. Wade, and even refuses to make exceptions for cases of rape and incest. This ban necessitates codifying Roe v. Wade.’” [NPR, 9/24/21]
Miller-Meeks Said Roe V. Wade Was “Only Temporary. This Is Only Until Women Have Access To Birth Control.” “In 1973 as I had mentioned to you all last session I had left home at 16 to find a way to put myself through college and medical school. So in 1973 when Roe v. Wade was decided, at that time in Texas what we said was ‘this is only temporary. This is only until women have access to birth control.’” [Iowa State Senate Floor, 2/13/20] (VIDEO) 00:00:00

September 2020: Miller-Meeks Said That If Roe V. Wade Were Overturned, Power Would Go Back To The States. “President Donald Trump is working to replace the late Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg. Conservatives hope another conservative on the bench could ultimately lead the court to overturn the 1973 Roe vs. Wade historic case that legalized a woman’s right to abortion. Thursday night the two candidates had to answer what would happen if the court does overturn that case. ‘That’s going to be an interesting time when that happens. I think that this is an issue that we’ve been talking about for 40 years. It’s unfortunate that we’re still having this conversation when we know that women have a right to privacy,’ said Hart. ‘I’m pro-life, I’ve been pro-life. I’ve had exceptions for rape, incest, and the physical life of the mother. I still have that stand. That’s my viewpoint. I think if Roe vs. Wade is overturned, then it goes back to the states,’ Miller-Meeks stated.” [WHO 13 Des Moines, 9/25/20]

Miller-Meeks Said That Planned Parenthood Was “Synonymous” With Abortion And Voted To Defund Planned Parenthood In The Iowa Senate

2019: Miller-Meeks Voted To Defund Planned Parenthood

2019: Miller-Meeks Voted For HF 766, The Health And Human Services Appropriation Bill. Miller-Meeks voted for HF 766, “A bill for an act relating to appropriations for health and human services and veterans and including other related provisions and appropriations, providing penalties, and including effective date and retroactive and other applicability date provisions.” The bill passed 31-17. [Iowa State Legislature, HF 766, 4/27/19]

- **HF 766 Prohibited Grant Funding For Any Sex Education Program Administered By An Organization That “Performs Or Promotes Abortions.”** “Any contract entered into on or after July 1, 2019, by the department of public health to administer the personal responsibility education program as specified in 42 U.S.C. §713 or to administer the sexual risk avoidance education grant program authorized pursuant to section 510 of Tit. v of the federal Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. §710, as amended by section 50502 of the federal Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018, Pub. L. No. 115-123, and as further amended by division S, Title VII, section 701 of the federal Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2018, Pub. L. No. 115-141, shall exclude as an eligible applicant, any applicant entity that performs abortions, promotes abortions, maintains or operates a facility where abortions are performed or promoted, contracts or subcontracts with an entity that performs or promotes abortions, becomes or continues to be an affiliate of any entity that performs or promotes abortions, or regularly makes referrals to an entity that provides or promotes abortions or maintains or operates a facility where abortions are performed.” [Iowa State Legislature, HF 766 Sec. 99-100, 4/27/19]

- **HF 766 Prohibited Grant Funding For Planned Parenthood And Banned Medicaid From Covering Transition-Related Health Care In Iowa.** “On Saturday, the Iowa House passed HF 766 (the Health and Human Services budget bill). The bill bans Medicaid and all other insurance coverage funded by public dollars from paying for transition-related medical services for transgender Iowans. The bill also prevents Planned Parenthood and other entities that provide abortion services from engaging in competitive bidding for certain sexual education federal grants. The Iowa Senate passed the bill less than 24 hours earlier.” [WHO 13 Des Moines, 4/27/19]
Iowa City Press-Citizen: Miller-Meeks Voted “To Defund Planned Parenthood In The 2019 Health And Human Services Budget.” “Woolson said Miller-Meeks' record demonstrates her stance on abortion. She supported an anti-abortion amendment to the Iowa Constitution, as well as a vote to defund Planned Parenthood in the 2019 Health and Human Services budget.” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 5/2/20]

2012: Miller-Meeks Tweeted That Planned Parenthood Was Synonymous With Abortion

2012: Miller-Meeks Said Then-VP Biden “Subconsciously Admitted That Abortion And Planned Parenthood = Synonymous.” “He did say that...RT @scrowder: YES! Biden just subconsciously admitted that Abortion and Planned Parenthood = Synonymous! #VPDebate” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 10/11/12]

Miller-Meeks Voted To Repeal Iowans’ Right To Choose, Despite Admitting Her Constituents Wanted Her To Preserve That Right

2020: Miller-Meeks Voted For Amending The State Constitution To Repeal The Right To Abortion, Though A Majority Of Iowans Believed Abortion Should Be Legal In All Or Most Cases

2020: Miller-Meeks Voted For Amending The State Constitution To Repeal The Right To Abortion. Miller-Meeks voted for SJR 2001, “a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the State of Iowa to protect life by declaring that the Constitution of the State of Iowa shall not be construed to recognize, grant, or secure a right to abortion or to require the public funding of abortion.” The bill passed by vote 32-18. [Iowa State Legislature, SJR 2001, 2/13/20]

2021: 57% Of Iowans Said Abortion Should Be Legal In All Or Most Cases. A majority of Iowans say abortion should be legal, an 8 percentage point increase since 2020, a new Des Moines Register/Mediacom Iowa Poll shows. Fifty-seven percent of Iowans say abortion should be legal in most or all cases, while 38% say abortion should be illegal in most or all cases, and 5% aren't sure. The last time the question was asked, in a March 2020 Iowa Poll, 49% said abortion should be legal in all or most cases and 45% said it should be illegal in all or most cases. The latest poll of 805 Iowa adults was conducted Sept. 12-15 by Selzer & Co. It has a margin of error of plus or minus 3.5 percentage points. [Des Moines Register, 9/25/21]

Des Moines Register Called The Proposed Constitutional Amendment “An Attempt To Overturn A 2018 Iowa Supreme Court Decision That Protected Abortion Rights In The State.” “In Iowa's Legislature, Republican lawmakers have passed numerous abortion restrictions and are working to pass a constitutional amendment saying that the Iowa Constitution does not secure a right to abortion. It’s an attempt to overturn a 2018 Iowa Supreme Court decision that protected abortion rights in the state.” [Des Moines Register, 9/25/21]

Miller-Meeks Said She Was “Lobbied Heavily By Constituents” To Vote Against The Constitutional Amendment But Voted In Favor Of The Amendment “Because That’s What I Believed In”

Miller-Meeks Said She Was “Lobbied Heavily By Constituents” To Vote Against The Constitutional Amendment But Voted In Favor Of The Amendment “Because That’s What I Believed In.” At a Marion County GOP Congressional Forum, Miller-Meeks said “Well I think you’re there- the party, and we’ve talked about the party platform earlier, represents a set of values. So within those set of values you vote in accordance with them. You are also there to represent your district, but I would disagree in saying that you vote purely by your district. And I’ll give you an example. I’m in a Democrat senate district. When we passed the constitutional amendment, the life amendment, to the constitution and I spoke on the floor about the amendment, I was lobbied heavily by constituents in my district to vote against it. I had many more people contact me to vote against it than to vote for it. So if I had gone along with my district I would have voted against it but I voted for it because that’s what I believed in. So it would not have mattered what my party wanted, and I voted against my district because
I’m in a Democrat district, but I voted my value system and beliefs. So I think as much as you can you’re trying to do it within your belief and values system and in accordance with what you have been elected to represent with your platform and your party.” [Marion County GOP Congressional Forum, 00:43:00, 5/14/20] (VIDEO)

- **Miller-Meeks’ Statement Was In Response To The Question Of Whether She Would Work For The GOP Or The Citizens Of Iowa’s 2nd District In DC.** At a Marion County GOP Congressional Forum, Miller-Meeks was asked “I believe that most of the people that have been elected to go to Washington vote mainly party. Both Pelosi and McCarthy have the uncanny ability to whip their members into line. And so we very rarely see disagreements from within the party. I believe that it’s the candidates responsibility to represent the people of the district are elected to and not just represent the party. We need to work with the people of our district and represent what they want us to do.” [Marion County GOP Congressional Forum, 00:41:00, 5/14/20] (VIDEO)

**Miller-Meeks Was A Staunch Opponent Of The Affordable Care Act**

**Miller-Meeks Was A Staunch Opponent Of The Affordable Care Act, Which She Claimed Failed To Lower Premiums And Limited Patient Choice Of Insurance And Providers**

Miller-Meeks said the ACA had failed to provide affordable health care choices “rather than putting bureaucrats in between you and your doctor.” “Health care became a focal issue in the race, with Hart and Miller-Meeks campaigns sparring over each other's records over support for protecting health insurance coverage for Iowans with pre-existing conditions and handling of the pandemic. [...] Miller-Meeks, an ophthalmologist and former director of the Iowa Department of Public Health, has insisted she has always supported protections for pre-existing conditions. However, she said the ACA has failed to lower insurance premiums and provide affordable, accessible health care that provides choice ‘rather than putting bureaucrats in between you and your doctor.’ Miller-Meeks has said she backs efforts by House Republicans to put forth legislation that would continue to provide protections and coverage for Americans with pre-existing conditions, should the law be overturned by the court.” [Quad-City Times, 11/4/20]

**October 2020: Miller-Meeks Said She Supported Protections For Pre-Existing Conditions But That The Affordable Care Act Had Not Brought Down The Price Of Health Care Premiums Or Allowed Choice.**

“Democrats have criticized Miller-Meeks for her past support of repealing the Affordable Care Act. ‘We agree that the next few years will be critical when it comes to improving Americans’ health care,’ Hart campaign spokesman Riley Kilburg said in a statement. ‘Unfortunately, Mariannette Miller-Meeks supports repealing the Affordable Care Act, which would eliminate protections for those living with pre-existing conditions and coverage for essential health benefits — all while stripping more than 230,000 Iowans of their care during a pandemic. That’s not the approach Iowans need.’ Miller-Meeks has said she supports protections for pre-existing conditions and would back efforts by House Republicans to continue to provide such protections and coverage for Americans, should the law be overturned by the U.S. Supreme Court. But, she has argued the ACA has failed to bring down the price of premiums and allow choice.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 10/21/20]

**Miller-Meeks Insisted She Had Always Supported Protections For Pre-Existing Conditions But That Under The ACA Health Care Premiums Had Gone Up And Would Continue To Rise.** “Hart and national Democrats have criticized Miller-Meeks for her past support of repealing the Affordable Care Act. […] Miller-Meeks insisted she has always supported protections for pre-existing conditions; however, (health care premiums) have gone up and they've continued to go up. ‘We need health care that is affordable, accessible, portable and still allows us to have choice,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘Employers are now looking at an average policy around $21,000 and employees' portion is around $5,500. ... We haven't made health insurance more affordable and we haven't made it portable. However, we did get more access to care. I appreciate that there was more people covered under insurance, but the other avenues ... were not addressed. Allowing people to purchase medical insurance state lines, tort reform, allowing more choice are all things that can help to lower cost.’” [Quad-City Times, 10/12/20]
October 2020: Miller-Meeks said that because of the Affordable Care Act, “employers are now looking at an average policy around $21,000 and employees' portion is around $5,500.” “Hart and national Democrats have criticized Miller-Meeks for her past support of repealing the Affordable Care Act. [...] Miller-Meeks insisted she has always supported protections for pre-existing conditions; however, ‘(health care premiums) have gone up and they've continued to go up.' ‘We need health care that is affordable, accessible, portable and still allows us to have choice,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘Employers are now looking at an average policy around $21,000 and employees' portion is around $5,500. ... We haven’t made health insurance more affordable and we haven’t made it portable. However, we did get more access to care. I appreciate that there was more people covered under insurance, but the other avenues ... were not addressed. Allowing people to purchase medical insurance state lines, tort reform, allowing more choice are all things that can help to lower cost.’” [Quad-City Times, 10/12/20]

Miller-Meeks on the Affordable Care Act: “We haven't made health insurance more affordable and we haven't made it portable. However, we did get more access to care.” “Hart and national Democrats have criticized Miller-Meeks for her past support of repealing the Affordable Care Act. [...] Miller-Meeks insisted she has always supported protections for pre-existing conditions; however, ‘ACA did not bring costs down.’ ‘What's more important is: How do we get affordable, accessible health care that's portable?’ she said. ‘How do we keep costs down? And there's way to do it’ through more pricing transparency.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 9/25/20]

September 2020: Miller-Meeks said the “ACA did not bring costs down.” “Miller-Meeks insisted she has always supported protections for preexisting conditions; however, the ‘ACA did not bring costs down.’ ‘What's more important is: How do we get affordable, accessible health care that's portable?’ she said. ‘How do we keep costs down? And there's way to do it’ through more pricing transparency.” [YouTube, Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 11/14/19]

2019: Miller-Meeks claimed the ACA had caused increased premiums and drug prices through triggering consolidation of medical practices and hospitals.

2019: Miller-Meeks claimed the ACA had caused increased premiums and drug prices through triggering consolidation of medical practices and hospitals. “Also with the Affordable Care Act we saw premiums increase dramatically, we saw drug prices go up dramatically, we’ve seen consolidation of hospitals to larger hospital systems, and we’ve also seen consolidation of small independent physician practices into larger practices or consumed by hospital or health care systems. All of this has led to increased costs, so absolutely what happens at the federal government level affects me every single day and how I can deliver the best care, the highest quality care, the most accessible care possible to my patients.” [YouTube, Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 11/14/19] (VIDEO) 00:02:55

2019: Miller-Meeks said electronic medical records use mandated by the ACA was “very cumbersome and takes a lot of time” and robbed patients of face time with providers.

Miller-Meeks said the use of electronic medical records mandated by the ACA was “very cumbersome and takes a lot of time” and robbed patients of face time with providers. “We’re now mandated to do electronic health records after the Affordable Care Act went through. And the electronic health records, while they may allow transmission of information, we don’t necessarily always have the data that we need, and it’s very cumbersome and takes a lot of time. It’s led to a lot of frustration in the provider community, whether you’re a doctor, a nurse practitioner or physician’s assistant, whether you’re an emergency room provider, it’s led to so much frustration within the healthcare community that we’re spending more and more time on an electronic record with our back towards our patient and less and less face to face time.” [YouTube, Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 11/14/19] (VIDEO) 00:02:17
Miller-Meeks: “Allowing People To Purchase Medical Insurance State Lines, Tort Reform, Allowing More Choice Are All Things That Can Help To Lower Cost.” “Hart and national Democrats have criticized Miller-Meeks for her past support of repealing the Affordable Care Act. [...] Miller-Meeks insisted she has always supported protections for pre-existing conditions; however, ‘(health care premiums) have gone up and they've continued to go up.’ ‘We need health care that is affordable, accessible, portable and still allows us to have choice,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘Employers are now looking at an average policy around $21,000 and employees’ portion is around $5,500. ... We haven't made health insurance more affordable and we haven't made it portable. However, we did get more access to care. I appreciate that there was more people covered under insurance, but the other avenues ... were not addressed. Allowing people to purchase medical insurance state lines, tort reform, allowing more choice are all things that can help to lower cost.” [Quad-City Times, 10/12/20]

September 2020: Iowa City Press-Citizen: Miller-Meeks “Has Been On The Record About Her Support For Repealing The ACA” And Said Congress Needed To Prepare For If It Was Overturned By The Supreme Court. “Like the Republican colleagues she hopes to join, Miller-Meeks has been on the record about her support for repealing the ACA. During Thursday's debate, she said Congress needs to prepare for replacing it. ‘Given that this is coming to the Supreme Court in the next month, I think Congress needs to - in a bipartisan way - both parties get together and work on what happens should the ACA be overturned. We don't know if it will be, but we need to start working on that provision right now. And make sure people continue to have coverage and preexisting conditions are covered as well,’ Miller-Meeks said.” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 9/28/20]

- September 2020: Miller-Meeks Said That A Trump Executive Order To Address Surprise Medical Billing And Protect Pre-Existing Conditions Would Not Solve The Problems Following A Potential Supreme Court Decision. “White House officials this week announced that President Donald Trump will sign an executive order to address surprise medical billing and safeguard insurance for people with existing medical conditions, even as his administration backs a Supreme Court challenge that could undo such protections. Miller-Meeks said such an order wouldn't solve the problem, should the U.S. Supreme Court rule the health law unconstitutional, ‘but it certainly helps set a framework and some groundwork’ for Congress to pass new health care provisions. ‘We need to start working on that provision now, and make sure people continue to have coverage, and preexisting conditions are covered as well,’ Miller-Meeks said.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 9/25/20]

2020: Women Vote! Ran A TV Ad Claiming Miller-Meeks Supported A Plan That Could Cost 187,000 Iowans Their Insurance Coverage And Fail To Protect For Pre-Existing Conditions

September 2020: Women Vote! Ran An Ad Claiming “Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Who Took Thousands From Big Insurance, Supported A Plan That Could Cost 187,000 Iowans Their Coverage Or Let Insurers Deny It Because Of Preexisting Conditions, Like Diabetes.” “One of those ads is by Women Vote!, a Super PAC of Emily's List, a network formed in 1985 with the goal of electing more pro-abortion rights Democratic women to office. The 30-second ad starts by mentioning COVID-19 and showing images of damage from the Aug. 10 derecho. 'During a pandemic, in the wake of a disaster, losing your health insurance would be devastating,' the voice says. The ad claims 'Mariannette Miller-Meeks, who took thousands from big insurance, supported a plan that could cost 187,000 Iowans their coverage or let insurers deny it because of preexisting conditions, like diabetes.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 9/28/20]

A Fact-Check By The Cedar Rapids Gazette Gave The Women Vote! Ad A “B” Grade Overall, Saying Miller-Meeks “Has Been Vocal About Wanting To Get Rid Of” The Affordable Care Act
A Fact-Check By The Cedar Rapids Gazette Gave The Women Vote! Ad A “B” Grade Overall. “The attacks in this ad against Mariannette Miller-Meeks are similar to those against other Republicans in congressional races across the country. PolitiFact scored a nearly identical ad 'true' in the 7th District contest in Virginia. That ad says Republican challenger Nick Frietas 'supports a plan letting insurance companies deny coverage for preexisting conditions like asthma or diabetes.' While Miller-Meeks hasn't served in Congress and hasn't had a chance to vote on a repeal of the Affordable Care Act, she has been vocal about wanting to get rid of it. If Women Vote! had stopped after the first three claims, the group would have gotten an A overall. But the fourth claim, which got a D, sinks the check to a B.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 9/28/20]

Cedar Rapids Gazette: “While Miller-Meeks Hasn't Served In Congress And Hasn't Had A Chance To Vote On A Repeal Of The Affordable Care Act, She Has Been Vocal About Wanting To Get Rid Of It.” “While Miller-Meeks hasn't served in Congress and hasn't had a chance to vote on a repeal of the Affordable Care Act, she has been vocal about wanting to get rid of it.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 9/28/20]

The Cedar Rapids Gazette Fact-Check Gave The Claim That Miller-Meeks Had Accepted $304,000 In Campaign Donations From The Insurance And Health Care Industries An “A” Grade. “The first, which appears as screen text, says Miller-Meeks accepted $304,000 in campaign donations from the insurance and health care industries. Women Vote! gets this number by adding together two numbers from the Center for Responsive Politics, which tracks money donated to U.S. House and Senate candidates using filings to the Federal Election Commission. First, the center's Open Secrets website shows Miller-Meeks, an ophthalmologist and former Iowa Department of Public Health director, accepted, in the course of her political career, $297,582 in donations from people and PACs in the health industry. Miller-Meeks has run unsuccessfully for the 2nd District seat three other times before 2020. Open Secrets reported Miller-Meeks accepted $12,405 from donors in the finance/insurance/real estate industry. Together, that equals $309,987, which is higher than the total in the ad because Women Vote! pulled the data for the ad on Aug. 21. Grade: A.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 9/28/20]

Cedar Rapids Gazette: Miller-Meeks Said She “Supported An Overhaul Or Repeal” Of The Affordable care Act When She Ran For Congress In 2014. “Claim 2: The second claim is that Miller-Meeks 'supported a plan that could cost 187,000 Iowans their coverage.' The ad doesn't say specifically which plan they're talking about, but a citation to a Center for American Progress article talks about the Affordable Care Act, or Obamacare. Miller-Meeks has never been in Congress, so she didn't vote against the act when it was approved in 2010. But she did say in 2014, when she was running for the 2nd District against incumbent Democrat Dave Loebsack, she supported an overhaul or repeal of the law. ‘Looking at the Affordable Care Act, there are ways we can change it, modify it, and/or, if possible, repeal it, but you have to gain the Senate, but at least, let's make it work for people,’ Miller-Meeks said in a Feb. 27, 2014, article in the Daily Iowan. She also tweeted her opposition to the law while she was state Public Health director, the Des Moines Register reported in 2014. In a debate Thursday, Miller-Meeks said she always has supported protections for preexisting conditions and that any repeal would have to come with a new health care law, the Quad-City Times reported. 'It just doesn't make sense that we're going to jerk this away without a plan in place,' she said. […] Women Vote! is right — underplaying even — the number of Iowans who depend on the Affordable Care Act for health care and Miller-Meeks’ past comments about being willing to consider repeal. We give this claim an A.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 9/28/20]

Cedar Rapids Gazette: “Women Vote! Is Right — Underplaying Even — The Number Of Iowans Who Depend On The Affordable Care Act For Health Care And Miller-Meeks’ Past Comments About Being Willing To Consider Repeal.” “Claim 2: The second claim is that Miller-Meeks 'supported a plan that could cost 187,000 Iowans their coverage.' The ad doesn't say specifically which plan they're talking about, but a citation to a Center for American Progress article talks about the Affordable Care Act, or Obamacare. […] So the question is how many Iowans would lose coverage if the health law was repealed. This number comes from two groups. First are Iowans enrolled in health care exchanges through the act, of which there were 49,210 in 2019, The Gazette reported. The number came from a report by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. Second are Iowans who are enrolled in the Iowa Health and Wellness Program, which is the state's expansion of Medicaid allowed through the act. There were 195,059 Iowans in the most recent enrollment, the Iowa Department of Human Services reported. These two numbers add up to 244,269 Iowans who could lose their health care coverage if the
law was repealed. Grade: Women Vote! is right — underplaying even — the number of Iowans who depend on the Affordable Care Act for health care and Miller-Meeks’ past comments about being willing to consider repeal. We give this claim an A.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 9/28/20]

The Cedar Rapids Gazette Fact-Check Gave The Claim “Miller-Meeks Supported A Plan That Would Allow Insurers To Deny Health Care Coverage Because Of Preexisting Conditions” An “A” Grade. “Claim 3: The third claim is that Miller-Meeks supported a plan that would allow insurers to deny health care coverage because of preexisting conditions, including diabetes. Several Republican-proposed bills would have offered less protection for people with preexisting conditions, FactCheck.org reported in April 2019. The American Health Care Act, for example, would have required insurers to offer coverage despite preexisting conditions, but they could charge more in some cases. The House passed the legislation in 2017, but the Senate never voted on it. The House GOP bill also would have given states the option of setting their own list of essential benefits insurance companies had to cover, which could mean some services wouldn't be covered, FactCheck.org reported. Grade: A.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 9/28/20]

Under Miller-Meeks’ Leadership, The Iowa Department Of Public Health Had A Number Of Controversies Around Staffing, Negligence, And The Administration Of Programs

2011-2014: Miller-Meeks Served As Director Of Iowa Department Of Public Health

January 2014: Miller-Meeks Resigned As Director Of The Iowa Department Of Public Health. “Iowa's top public-health official, who was criticized this week for unsubstantiated comments about food stamps, has resigned. Dr. Mariannette Miller-Meeks' resignation was announced this morning by Gov. Terry Branstad. ‘It is with regret that I accept Mariannette's resignation, as she was a director who served with great passion,’ the governor said in a press release. ‘Mariannette has been a champion of health in Iowa, including working to promote our Healthiest State Initiative. Lieutenant Governor Reynolds and I thank her for her service to the people of Iowa.’ The Ottumwa ophthalmologist had been director of the Iowa Department of Public Health since Branstad took office three years ago.” [Des Moines Register, 1/9/14]

Miller-Meeks Said She Served As Director Of Iowa Department Of Public Health From 2011-2013.
According to Mariannette Miller-Meeks’ LinkedIn page, Miller-Meeks served as Director of Iowa Department of Public Health from 2011 to 2013. [Mariannette Miller-Meeks LinkedIn, accessed 1/25/22]

2012: Miller-Meeks Received $135,000 Salary As Director Of The Iowa Department of Public Health.
“Mariannette Miller-Meeks, director of the Iowa Department of Public Health: $135,000.” [Des Moines Register, 11/2/12]

Miller-Meeks Was Appointed Director Of The Iowa Department Of Public Health By Gov. Branstad

December 2010: Iowa Governor-Elect Terry Branstad Appointed Miller-Meeks As The Head Of The Iowa Department Of Public Health. “Iowa Gov.-elect Terry Branstad appointed former Congressional candidate Mariannette Miller-Meeks as the head of the Iowa Department of Public Health Thursday. Miller-Meeks, the first female faculty member in the University of Iowa ophthalmology department, will head the agency that works with local health organizations, lawmakers, and health-care providers to educate Iowa citizens on health. ‘I am honored to have been chosen by Gov. Branstad and Lt.-Gov.-elect Reynolds to head the Iowa Department of Public Health,’ said Miller-Meeks in a press release.” [Daily Iowan, 12/10/10]

Miller-Meeks Was Appointed Director Of The Iowa Department Of Public Health By Gov. Branstad. “Today we have announced that Dr. Mariannette Miller-Meeks will be the head of the Iowa Department of Public Health,” said Branstad. “Dr. Miller-Meeks’ dedication to public health is evident from her service and leadership in various medical organizations, and I look forward to working with her as we work to make Iowa the healthiest state in the nation.” [The Ottumwa Courier, 12/10/10]
Miller-Meeks Resigned Because She Was Planned On Running For Congress

**Miller-Meeks Resigned Because She Was Planned On Running For Congress.** The director of the Iowa Department of Public Health has resigned because she plans to run for Congress, Gov. Terry Branstad said Thursday. Mariannette Miller-Meeks recently faced criticism for a comment she made about food stamps. Branstad said he did not seek her resignation and said it had nothing to do with the remark. ‘I know what she’s intending to do,’ Branstad told reporters at the Capitol. And when reporters asked whether Miller-Meeks planned to run for the U.S. House from Iowa’s 2nd District for the third time, the governor acknowledged she would be doing just that.” [Hawk Eye, 1/10/14]

**Miller-Meeks’ Resignation Was Accepted By Gov. Terry Branstad.** “Miller-Meeks has run the health department since Gov. Terry Branstad took office in 2011. He announced her resignation in a press release this morning: ‘It is with regret that I accept Mariannette’s resignation, as she was a director who served with great passion,’ Branstad wrote. ‘Mariannette has been a champion of health in Iowa, including working to promote our Healthiest State Initiative. Lieutenant Governor Reynolds and I thank her for her service to the people of Iowa.’” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 1/9/14]

**Miller-Meeks Signed A Secret $20,000 Settlement With An Employee Who Lost Her Job But Filed A Grievance Stating That Her Termination Was Based On Politics**

**Miller-Meeks Signed A $20,000 Settlement With An Employee Who Lost Her Job But Filed A Grievance Stating That Her Termination Was Based On Politics.** “You can appreciate the state budget is a $7 billion enterprise and certainly the governor is not going to be involved in approving all the expenditures,” said Gerd Clabaugh, the health department’s interim director. Clabaugh was the boss of one employee who lost her job in 2012 because of what the administration called a reorganization. However, the employee, Pam Deichmann, claimed in a grievance filed against the state that her termination was based on her politics and support for tougher hospital reporting standards of infections. Former health department director Mariannette Miller-Meeks signed Diechmann’s $20,000 settlement. Miller-Meeks, who resigned in January to run for the U.S. House, on Monday declined to talk about whether she discussed the matter with Branstad.” [Des Moines Register, 3/18/14]

- Des Moines Register: “Employees Claimed They Had Lost Their Jobs Because Of Republican Cronyism.” “Lt. Gov. Kim Reynolds said Monday that neither she nor Gov. Terry Branstad was aware of six secret settlements paid to former state employees until they read it in Sunday’s Des Moines Register. Most of the employees claimed they had lost their jobs because of Republican cronyism. The Register’s report also revealed the six were asked to sign unenforceable confidentiality agreements that seemingly prohibited them from speaking about the settlements.” [Des Moines Register, 3/18/14]

**Miller-Meeks Failed To Stand Up For HIV-Positive Iowans When A Federally Funded High Risk Insurance Pool Refused To Provide Health Insurance Iowans That Were HIV-Positive**

**DMR Editorial: Miller-Meeks Failed To Stand Up For HIV-Positive Iowans When A Federally Funded High Risk Insurance Pool Refused To Provide Health Insurance Iowans That Were HIV-Positive.** “The Department of Public Health has a bureau to connect HIV-positive Iowans to drugs and care. Miller-Meeks should have been expressing outrage when a federally funded high risk insurance pool refused to provide health insurance to these Iowans as was intended.” [Des Moines Register, Editorial Board, 1/13/14]

**Miller-Meeks’ Department Of Health Came Under Fire After A State Audit Report Exposed The Agency For Not Inspecting Funeral Homes That Was Required By State Law**

**Miller-Meeks Said The State Had Not Inspected Funeral Homes For Decades, Leaving It To Cities And Counties To Regulate.** “A state auditor’s report on the Iowa Department of Public Health released Wednesday
criticized the agency for failing to inspect funeral homes as required by state law. […] ‘We take it seriously, and we’re working on a process of trying to amend the code,’ said Iowa Public Health Director Mariannette Miller-Meeks. She said the state hasn’t inspected funeral homes for decades, leaving it to cities and counties to handle through local ordinances.” [The Hawk Eye, 8/15/13]

Miller-Meeks Said The Agency Typically Relied On Local Government And OSHA Regulations. “She said her agency wants the authority to inspect funeral homes if concerns arise but typically rely on local government and the federal Occupational Safety and Health Administration regulations to oversee the operations. Auditors said the agency also has not performed the required inspections of hair salons every two years as outlined in the state code.” [The Hawk Eye, 8/15/13]

The Hawk Eye: Iowa Code Requires The Department To Inspect “All Places Where Dead Human Bodies Are Prepared Or Held For Burial, Entombment Or Cremation.” “In the public health report, the auditors said the Iowa Code requires the department to inspect ‘all places where dead human bodies are prepared or held for burial, entombment or cremation.’ The law gives the department the authority to adopt and enforce rules for inspections ‘necessary for the preservation of the public health.’ In June, the Board of Mortuary Science recommended changing the law to say the department may inspect the facilities instead of shall inspect them, department spokeswoman Polly Carver-Kimm said.” [The Hawk Eye, 8/15/13]

Miller-Meeks Was Accused Of Disregarding State Law By Not Consulting The Tobacco Use Prevention and Control Commission Before Hiring A New Administrator For The Tobacco Use Prevention Division

Miller-Meeks Was Accused Of Disregarding State Law By Not Consulting The Tobacco Use Prevention and Control Commission Before Hiring A New Administrator For The Tobacco Use Prevention Division. “Sen. Herman Quirmbach, D-Ames, a non-voting member of the commission, opened the meeting with a critique of O’Brien’s hiring. […] Friday's meeting of the Tobacco Use Prevention and Control Commission, which oversees the division, was her first formal introduction in that role. […] Iowa Department of Public Health Director Mariannette Miller-Meeks is empowered to appoint the division administrator, but state law calls for the commission to advise in the evaluation of candidates for the job and to consult with the public health director on hiring. The commission was not able to adequately review the applicants for the position, Quirmbach argued, and Miller-Meeks disregarded the preliminary recommendation by two commission members suggesting selection of another candidate.” [The Gazette, 7/22/12]

The Position Was Administrator For The Division Of Tobacco Use Prevention And Control. “A state senator questioned the qualifications of the woman recently hired as Iowa's top tobacco control official and accused the state's public health director of obstructing the law governing her hiring during a contentious meeting Friday. Meghan O'Brien was hired as the administrator for the Division of Tobacco Use Prevention and Control this month after an informal search process.” [The Gazette, 7/22/12]

Miller-Meeks Did Have The Choice To Hire Who She Wanted But Not Consulting The Commission Was Considered Evidence Of Miller-Meeks Weak Management Skills. “The ultimate choice (of who to hire) is up to the director, that’s clear under the code,’ Quirmbach said. ‘But this commission has not been afforded the opportunity to carry out its legal responsibility, and I fault the director of the Department of Public Health in that regard.’ In a later interview, Quirmbach called the manner in which the hiring played out ‘evidence of the weakness of Miller-Meeks’ own management skills.’ Miller-Meeks, however, said she consulted with the Iowa Attorney General’s Office and received assurances that the process that led to O’Brien’s hiring followed state law. The opportunities she gave to commission members to meet candidates were, in fact, ‘overly generous,’ she said.” [The Gazette, 7/22/12]

Miller-Meeks Had Narrowed The Choices Down To Two Finalists Which The Commission’s Chairwoman And Vice Chairman Recommended Hiring The Other Finalist. “The administrator position came open this
spring, when Interim Director Aaron Swanson left for another job. Several people applied, from which two -- including O’Brien -- were selected as finalists by Miller-Meeks. The commission’s chairwoman and vice chairman met both candidates and recommended hiring the other finalist, but no candidates were formally vetted by the full commission.” [The Gazette, 7/22/12]

The New Hire Was Questioned For Her Qualification For The Job, Citing No Management Experience And Little Background In Tobacco Policy Or Public Health. “Miller-Meeks formally hired O’Brien about two weeks ago. Beyond the process by which O’Brien was hired, Quirmbach also questioned her qualifications for the top job in the division. She has no management experience and little background in tobacco policy or public health, he said. Not everyone on the commission shared Quirmbach’s concerns.” [The Gazette, 7/22/12]

Miller-Meeks Cut The Position Of Iowa’s Division of Tobacco Use Prevention and Control Official And The Move Was Due To Budget Cuts, Leaving The Division Too Small To Operate Alone

Democrat State Senator Quirmbach Was Dismayed At The Dismissal, Saying He Had Heard That Miller-Meeks Had Planned On Disbanding The Tobacco Prevention Entirely And Had Little Interest In Developing Effective Policy

Miller-Meeks Said Talk About Folding The Division Duties Into The Health Department Had Been Going On For A While And She Needed To Fit Anti-Smoking Into A Tight Budget. “Miller-Meeks said Monday that her decision to cut the division director’s position was no reflection of Mapes’ job performance. She said state leaders had been talking for several years about folding the division’s duties into other parts of the health department, and she might ask legislators next session for authority to do so. Miller-Meeks said she needs to fit anti-smoking efforts into a tight budget, and it made more sense to focus the limited dollars on such things as the Quitline Iowa counseling program and local anti-smoking organizations rather than a separate state division.” [Des Moines Register, 8/2/11]

Anti-Smoking Lobbyists Questioned The Dismissal, Saying The Move Questioned How Serious The Governor Was Opposition On Smoking. “Threase Harms, a Des Moines lobbyist for the anti-smoking group Clean Air for Everyone, said Mapes’ dismissal raises questions about how serious Branstad is about his frequently stated opposition to smoking. ‘If they want Iowa to be the healthiest state in the nation, how are we going to do that without addressing the No. 1 cause of preventable deaths?’ she said.” [Des Moines Register, 8/2/11]

Gov. Branstad Had Signed Off On Miller-Meeks’ Decision To Terminate The Position. “Tim Albrecht, a spokesman for Branstad, said the governor is committed to combating smoking. He said the governor signed off on
Miller-Meeks’ decision to terminate Mapes’ position, and he said the governor understood the need to cut programs, including the anti-smoking ads. Given Iowa’s severe budget constraints, most departments and agencies saw a decrease in funding,’ Albrecht wrote. ‘Gov. Branstad believes tobacco cessation programs are important and necessary, and believes the money should be spent in a more effective manner.” [Des Moines Register, 8/2/11]

Miller-Meeks Proceeded To Name The Health Department Medical Director As Interim Administrator, Which Was Illegal Under Iowa Law

Miller-Meeks Proceeded To Name The Health Department Medical Director As Interim Administrator. “The budget cuts also led to a personnel dust-up after Branstad’s public health director, Dr. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, recently dismissed Bonnie Mapes, the administrator of the tobacco-control division. Miller-Meeks said the $99,000-per-year position was no longer needed because the division had shrunk, and she named Dr. Patricia Quinlisk as interim administrator. Quinlisk, the health department’s medical director, also oversees such things as efforts to combat infectious diseases and food-poisoning outbreaks.” [Des Moines Register, 8/6/11]

Miller-Meeks Backed Off The Plan When State Senators Cited Iowa Code That Said The Anti-Tobacco Division Must Have A Full-Time Administrator Whose Sole Duties Were Running The Division. “Miller-Meeks said Friday evening that she would back off the plan, about eight hours after two state senators complained at the commission meeting that the personnel shift was illegal. Sens. Herman Quirmbach and Jack Hatch noted a section of Iowa Code specifying that the health department must employ a full-time administrator for its anti-tobacco division and that the administrator’s sole duties must be running the division.” [Des Moines Register, 8/6/11]

Miller-Meeks Claimed She Had Spoken To The Iowa Attorney General Who Said Her Actions Were Legal But The AG Said He Did Not Advise Miller-Meeks

Miller-Meeks Claimed She Had Spoken To The Iowa Attorney General Who Said Her Actions Were Legal But The AG Said He Did Not Advise Miller-Meeks. “There is a law, and everybody has to obey the law,’ said Quirmbach, an Ames Democrat. ‘I have to obey the law. Dr. Miller-Meeks has to obey the law. The governor has to obey the law.’ Miller-Meeks, who was not at the meeting, responded in a statement later Friday that she had checked with the attorney general’s office, which told her the actions were legal. Later Friday afternoon, a spokesman for Attorney General Tom Miller disagreed. ‘We feel the statute is very clear. We did not advise that an Iowa Department of Public Health employee with significant other duties could serve as the tobacco division administrator,” said the spokesman, Geoff Greenwood.” [Des Moines Register, 8/6/11]

Miller-Meeks Was Investigating The Director Of The Iowa State Nursing Board When The Director Suddenly Retired

Miller-Meeks Was Investigating The Director Of The Iowa State Nursing Board When The Director Suddenly Retired. “The state’s top nursing regulator has retired unexpectedly and an associate director also has left with little explanation. Lorinda Inman, executive director of the Iowa Board of Nursing since 1988, chose to retire after state officials investigated complaints about human resources issues. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, director of the Iowa Department of Public Health, said her department and the Department of Administrative Services looked into ‘a few random complaints.’ After the investigation, Inman, who is 63, chose to retire. She did not immediately return calls.” [The Gazette, 2/26/13]

Miller-Meeks Declined To Be More Specific About The Investigation. “Miller-Meeks said Chris Newell, an associate director of the nursing board, also has left. Miller-Meeks declined to be more specific. The board regulates nursing licenses. Gov. Terry Branstad appoints members. His spokesman said he would have no comment.” [The Gazette, 2/26/13]
Des Moines Register: “Miller-Meeks Stressed That The Allegations Did Not Involve Licensing Issues Or Regulation Of The Tens Of Thousands Of Iowa Nurses Overseen By The Agency.” “Miller-Meeks stressed that the allegations did not involve licensing issues or regulation of the tens of thousands of Iowa nurses overseen by the agency. […] Miller-Meeks noted that the board is ‘quasi-independent’ from the health department, but she said the department helps with some of its administrative tasks, including human resources. Gov. Terry Branstad appoints members of the nursing board, but his spokesman, Tim Albrecht, said the governor’s office would have no comment. Inman, 63, was paid $108,946 last year, state records show.” [Des Moines Register, 2/26/13]

Des Moines Register Editorial: Miller-Meeks Had “Little To Say” About Affordable Care Act Implementation, Despite Her Role

Des Moines Register Editorial: Miller-Meeks Had “Little To Say” About Affordable Care Act Implementation, Despite Her Role. “As a massive health reform law was being implemented, she had little to say. This was surprising, as health insurance is such an important part of her agency’s mission to ‘promote and protect public health.’ Her silence is notable, too, because she was uninsured during her 2010 campaign for Congress.” [Des Moines Register, Editorial Board, 1/13/14]

HEADLINE: The Register's Editorial: “Health Chief Needs To Be A Voice For Public.” [Des Moines Register, Editorial Board, 1/13/14]

2016: Miller-Meeks Was Rejected By The Iowa Senate To Serve On The Iowa Hawk-I Board Due To Her Record As Director Of The Department Of Public Health

2016: Miller-Meeks Was Rejected By Iowa Senate To Serve On A Health Care Board Because Critics Worried She Was Too Close To The Branstad Administration. “The Iowa Senate on Thursday rejected Gov. Terry Branstad’s nomination of former state health director Mariannette Miller-Meeks to the Iowa Hawk-I Board, which advises the state on health care coverage for uninsured children of working families. Miller-Meeks needed 34 votes - a two-thirds majority - to be confirmed. Her nomination failed on a 28-18 vote… Sen. Janet Petersen, D-Des Moines, who opposed Miller-Meeks’ confirmation, said the Hawk-I Board needs a person who will stand up for Iowa’s families and children, as opposed to someone who will stand with the Branstad administration.” [Des Moines Register, 4/16/16]

- Hawk-I Or Hawki Is The Healthy And Well Kids In Iowa Program Offered Through The Children’s Health Insurance Program (CHIP). “The Children’s Health Insurance Program (CHIP) is offered through the Healthy and Well Kids in Iowa program, also known as Hawki. Iowa offers Hawki health coverage for uninsured children of working families. No family pays more than $40 a month. Some families pay nothing at all. A child who qualifies for Hawki health insurance will get their health coverage through a Managed Care Organization (MCO). These are the MCOs or health plans you can choose from: Amerigroup Iowa, Inc. and Iowa Total Care.” [Iowa Department of Human Services, accessed 6/2/20]

Miller-Meeks’ Time As Head Of The Department Of Public Health Concerned Some Lawmakers

Miller-Meeks’ Time As Head Of The Department Of Public Health Concerned Some Lawmakers. “An Iowa Senate panel agreed Monday to move Gov. Terry Branstad’s appointment of Mariannette Miller-Meeks to the state Hawk-I board to the Senate’s confirmation calendar without recommendation. Miller-Meeks, 60, served as director of the Department of Public Health under Branstad from 2011 to 2013 and three times lost to Democrat Dave Loebsack in the 2nd Congressional District. Some members of the Senate Human Resources Committee have expressed concern about her time as head of the Department of Public Health and the appointment to a board that
overssees the state’s children’s health insurance program as it changes to privatized Medicaid services April 1.” [The Gazette, 3/22/16]

- **Senator Mathis, D-Linn, Said Miller-Meeks Was Unhelpful When Mathis Asked For Support On An Alzheimer’s Bill When Miller-Meeks’ Was Director Of The State Department Of Public Health.** “All 18 no votes came from Iowa Democrats, including Sen. Liz Mathis of Linn County. Mathis raised concerns about Miller-Meeks work as director of the Iowa Department of Public Health, saying she was unhelpful when Mathis asked for support on an Alzheimer’s bill. ‘When I was advocating for Alzheimer’s patients, their families and providers who care for people with dementia-related illness, (Miller-Meeks) was unresponsive to my plea and theirs for two years in a row,’ said Sen. Mathis. ‘That experience, along with other Senators who have worked with her, convinced me she is not the best choice to join the Hawk-I Board.’” [KCRG, 4/16/16]

- **Critics Said Miller-Meeks Was Not The Right Fit Because She Would “Worry About The Reduction In Services And The Bottom-Line Costs” Instead Of The Human Element.** “Critics expressed concern about her time as Branstad’s chief of the state public health agency and her appointment to a state board that provides direction to the state Department of Human Services on the state’s children’s health insurance program at a time when the governor is moving Medicaid services to privately managed care. ‘We need a Hawk-I board member that has a strong knowledge of the health insurance programs that will advocate for affordable, accessible, comprehensive care for children and not just worry about the reduction in services and the bottom-line costs, especially in this period of transition to a managed care environment,’ said Sen. Amanda Ragan, D-Mason City. ‘This is not a fit that I think is good for Hawk-I or the state of Iowa, especially in this change.’” [The Gazette, 4/15/16]

- **Gazette: “Quirmbach, D-Ames, Said Miller-Meeks Displayed Weaknesses In Her Commitment, Her Listening Skills And Her Failure To Consult With Others Regarding Personnel Decisions During His Interactions With Her When She Directed The State Department Of Public Health.”** “Critics expressed concern about her time as Branstad’s chief of the state public health agency and her appointment to a state board that provides direction to the state Department of Human Services on the state’s children’s health insurance program at a time when the governor is moving Medicaid services to privately managed care. ‘We need a Hawk-I board member that has a strong knowledge of the health insurance programs that will advocate for affordable, accessible, comprehensive care for children and not just worry about the reduction in services and the bottom-line costs, especially in this period of transition to a managed care environment,’ said Sen. Amanda Ragan, D-Mason City. ‘This is not a fit that I think is good for Hawk-I or the state of Iowa, especially in this change.’ Sen. Herman Quirmbach, D-Ames, said Miller-Meeks displayed weaknesses in her commitment, her listening skills and her failure to consult with others regarding personnel decisions during his interactions with her when she directed the state Department of Public Health.” [The Gazette, 4/15/16]

**Iowa Hawk-I Board Advised The State On Health Care Coverage For Uninsured Children Of Working Families**

**Iowa Hawk-I Board Advised The State On Health Care Coverage For Uninsured Children Of Working Families.** “The Iowa Senate on Thursday rejected Gov. Terry Branstad’s nomination of former state health director Mariannette Miller-Meeks to the Iowa Hawk-I Board, which advises the state on health care coverage for uninsured children of working families. Miller-Meeks needed 34 votes - a two-thirds majority - to be confirmed. Her nomination failed on a 28-18 vote…Sen. Janet Petersen, D-Des Moines, who opposed Miller-Meeks’ confirmation, said the Hawk-I Board needs a person who will stand up for Iowa’s families and children, as opposed to someone who will stand with the Branstad administration.” [Des Moines Register, 4/16/16]
Miller-Meeks Was A Threat To Iowans’ Jobs, Economy, And Retirement Security

**Significant Findings**

**Miller-Meeks Publicly Supported A “Big Infrastructure Bill” On The Campaign Trail And In Congress, Then Voted Against The Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill Despite The Fact That Her District Had The Second-Most Troubled Bridges In The Country.**

✓ Miller-Meeks advocated for a bipartisan infrastructure bill in 2020 and 2021 – then voted against the Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill granting Iowa millions of dollars for bridge repair – then requested funds from the legislation.

✓ Miller-Meeks said congressional Democrats should have focused on passing a bipartisan infrastructure bill in 2021 and called for a “big infrastructure bill” while campaigning in 2020.

✓ November 2021: Miller-Meeks voted against the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, providing $550 billion in new infrastructure spending and creating millions of jobs.

✓ Associated Press: Miller-Meeks “objected to majority Democrats’ handling of the bill, never mentioning its contents” instead of addressing district needs.

✓ Associated Press: The Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act “would pour more than $100 million in federal money to repair and replace bridges into southwest Iowa.”

✓ Iowa’s 2nd congressional district had the second-most troubled bridges in the country, including key bridges connecting the Quad Cities and a bridge linking a key freight route.

✓ December 2021: Miller-Meeks joined a letter asking for funds from the Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill to be allocated to river locks and dams in Iowa.

**Miller-Meeks Voted Against Funding For Projects That Would Directly Benefit Her District And Constituents, Including Funding She Had Specifically Requested.**

✓ Miller-Meeks voted against the INVEST in America Act that included more than $15 million for projects in her district, including those she had requested funding for.

✓ Miller-Meeks voted against the INVEST in America Act, which would authorize more than $720 billion in transportation and water infrastructure projects, calling it too costly.

✓ Miller-Meeks wrote an op-ed touting the “opportunity to invest in infrastructure we have long known was in need of repair” days after voting against infrastructure funding.

✓ The INVEST in America Act included more than $15 million for projects in Iowa’s 2nd congressional district, many of which she requested funds for herself.

✓ Miller-Meeks voted against millions of dollars of her own earmarks.

✓ 2021: Miller-Meeks requested a total of $36,650,000 in earmarks.
Eight of Miller-Meeks’ community project funding requests totaling $32,900,000 were included in a group of appropriations bills she voted against.

Miller-Meeks voted against infrastructure funding she requested for her district days before writing an op-ed touting the “opportunity to invest in infrastructure we have long known was in need of repair.”

**Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Build Back Better Act And Made False Claims About Its Tax Provisions.**

- Miller-Meeks voted against the Build Back Better Act (BBB), which would invest just under $2 trillion in reducing the cost of prescription drugs, health care, child care, housing and energy for American families.

- Miller-Meeks made multiple false or questionable criticisms of BBB:
  - Miller-Meeks falsely claimed BBB was “full of tax giveaways for the wealthy at the expense of hard-working American families.”
  - Independent fact-checkers found BBB would cut taxes for nearly 9 in 10 households, while its tax increases were aimed at large corporations and the wealthiest individuals.
  - Miller-Meeks falsely claimed BBB would cause inflation, but economists agreed the bill would not contribute to inflation and would in fact ease inflationary pressures.

**Miller-Meeks Repeatedly Supported Tax Plans That Benefited The Wealthy At The Expense Of The Middle Class And Working Families And Supported Cutting Taxes For Corporations And The Wealthiest Americans.**

- Miller-Meeks campaigned in 2020 on preserving the 2017 Republican tax cuts.

- 2010: Miller-Meeks said she supported extending the Bush tax cuts.

- Miller-Meeks supported tax systems that benefitted the wealthy at the expense of the middle class.
  - Miller-Meeks said she wanted people to have the opportunity to choose a “Flat Tax,” which would be a windfall for the wealthy while increasing taxes on the middle class.
  - Ottumwa Courier: Miller-Meeks “voiced support for the ‘Fair Tax’ that even her own party’s experts acknowledge would be anything but fair to middle class Americans.”

- June 2021: Miller-Meeks said she did not want to raise taxes on corporations because “taxes on investment hurts all of us.”
  - Miller-Meeks repeatedly said she favored cuts to corporate income tax rates before TCJA became law.

- Miller-Meeks repeatedly argued against taxing the estates of multi-millionaires.
  - Miller-Meeks argued repealing stepped-up basis would “force heirs to sell all or parcels of farmland to pay large taxes on assets that they simply cannot afford to pay off.”
August 2021: Miller-Meeks tweeted “the death tax has hurt family farms across Iowa for years and doubling down on this will hurt them even more.”

2012: Miller-Meeks said she liked the idea of abolishing the estate tax.

Miller-Meeks Opposed Allowing Medicare To Negotiate Drug Prices, Repeatedly Voted To Threaten Medicare And Social Security, And Supported Plans To End Medicare As We Know It And Privatize Social Security.

2021: Miller-Meeks said she opposed allowing Medicare to negotiate lower prescription drug prices, then claimed a month later that she was “still working” on “lowering prescription drug prices.”

2021: Miller-Meeks falsely claimed that government involvement in drug pricing would lead to rationing of care and restricted access to certain medications.

December 2021: Miller-Meeks voted against measures to raise the debt limit hours before the United States would have defaulted, threatening $20 billion in Social Security payments for seniors.

Miller-Meeks also voted against legislation preventing Medicare cuts, saying the bill was a “short-term fix” and complaining it was tied to the debt limit.

2012: Miller-Meeks supported a plan to turn Medicare into a voucher program, agreeing that a premium support plan “may not be politically correct, but it is medically correct.”

The program Miller-Meeks supported would end Medicare as we know it, giving Medicare recipients a fixed dollar amount to buy insurance on the private marketplace.

Miller-Meeks Advocated For A Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill, But Voted Against The Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill Granting Southeast Iowa $100 Million For Bridge Repair – Then Requested Funds From The Legislation

Miller-Meeks Said Congressional Democrats Should Have Focused On Passing A Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill Throughout 2021

Miller-Meeks Said Democrats Should “Pass An Infrastructure Bill” Because “They Would Have Bipartisan Support For That.” HOST: “If it’s such a great plan, why do they need to beg their own party to get on board?” MILLER-MEEKS: “They don’t need to beg their own party. Pass an infrastructure bill. They would have bipartisan support for that. Forget the other bill because they’re having difficulty even among their own party to get it through.” [YouTube, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 10/27/21] (VIDEO) 00:03:39

Miller-Meeks Said She Wanted Congress To Focus On Infrastructure And Should Be “Coming Together As Both Parties To Figure Out How We Fund Them.” “Iowa’s 2nd District Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks said she hoped Congress would focus on infrastructure alone. The bill, she said, will help Iowans with things like waterways, bridges, dams, and airports. ‘Concentrating on those things as infrastructure, and then coming together as both parties to figure out how we fund them, and what we need to do about our funding,’ Miller-Meeks said.” [Daily Iowan, 10/17/21]

Miller-Meeks Said She Could Support An Infrastructure Package That Was Focused On “Traditional Infrastructure” And “Doesn’t Raise Taxes.” NIEDLEMAN: “Now, there's a lot of focus on this bipartisan group of 10 senators to come up with an infrastructure deal. How confident are you that they'll come up with something that you can support?” MILLER-MEEKS: “Well, I think if you have a bill that is focused on infrastructure, such as
roads, bridges, locks and dams, waterways, airports, broadband, and then the electric grid infrastructure, which sometimes gets lost in this infrastructure bill, and doesn't raise taxes, then I think it's something that I could support. So, traditional infrastructure. The original bill that was floated had 115 billion for roads and bridges out of $2.3 trillion, and I think most people would say that's a bill that's very short-sighted. So, I think, you know, if it focuses on infrastructure, which we all agree with, then I do have confidence that something can come about that would be bipartisan, and I could vote for it.” [YouTube, Local 4 News WHBF, 6/20/21] (VIDEO)

Miller-Meeks: An Infrastructure Framework Around $1 Trillion Was “Workable” But If Further Spending Plans Included Tax Increases, “Negotiations Could Falter Once Again.” MILLER-MEEKS: “So, you know, a framework in the trillion-dollar range that's been compromised between both the Democrats and the Republican senators is something that's workable. You know, there's bipartisan support for an infrastructure bill. There's just not bipartisan support for a Democrat wish list which is what they're trying to push forward, which would include tax increases. So, I think the you know, the devil is in the details, as usual. And so, if they have a compromise of 1 trillion, but they're still floating this 6 trillion out there, where there would be tax increases, I think that it's possible that negotiations could falter once again.” [YouTube, Fox News, 6/19/21] 00:02:44 (VIDEO)

Miller-Meeks Op-Ed: Getting The Nation Back To Work After COVID-19 Was “Also An Opportunity To Invest In Infrastructure We Have Long Known Was In Need Of Repair.” “Iowans have reason to be optimistic. The state and the country are getting back to business, but the reality is the COVID-19 pandemic scarred our economy. Although Iowa businesses are challenged by a lack of workers, nationwide too many people continue to struggle with unemployment. In order to get our economy running at full capacity, it is important we get the nation back to work. It’s also an opportunity to invest in infrastructure we have long known was in need of repair.” [Ottumwa Courier, Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 7/6/21]

**Miller-Meeks Had Called For A “Big Infrastructure Bill” While Campaigning In 2020**

Cedar Rapids Gazette: Miller-Meeks “Called For A ‘Big Infrastructure Bill’ Before Taking Office, But It Is Unknown How She Will Vote” On The Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill. “Sen. Chuck Grassley, who touted his vote for a $1.2 trillion infrastructure package as an investment in Iowa’s future, isn’t advising his Iowa GOP House colleagues one way or the other as they prepare to vote on the plan Thursday. […] Third [sic] District Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks called for a ‘big infrastructure bill’ before taking office, but it is unknown how she will vote.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 9/29/21]

January 2021: Upon Her Swearing In, Miller-Meeks Cited Infrastructure As An Area Where Legislators Could “Move Things In A Bipartisan Fashion.” “Miller-Meeks said she is hopeful the diverse class of female freshmen will lend itself to more bipartisanship in a divided Congress, with narrow margins in both the House and Senate. ‘I think there are avenues and things that we can agree on, and I think there is an appetite to work together and accomplish that,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘I think you especially see that in the women legislators, but in all legislators. ... I do think we can accomplish things and we can, you know, move things in a bipartisan fashion.’ She said that includes ‘getting through pandemic and preparing for the next pandemic’; ‘bringing manufacturing back from China’ to address limited domestic stockpiles in medical supplies — including personal protective equipment (PPE) and pharmaceuticals — as the nation grapples with containing COVID-19; and pushing forward a long-stalled infrastructure spending bill to upgrade the nation's roads, bridges, locks and dams, and expand high-speed broadband internet service to rural and urban areas.” [Quad-City Times, 1/3/21]

September 2020: Miller-Meeks Said Her Top Priority In Office Would Be An Infrastructure Bill, Assuming The Pandemic Would Be Under Control When She Entered Office. “GOP congressional candidate Mariannette Miller-Meeks on Thursday said her top priority would be an infrastructure bill, assuming the coronavirus pandemic is under control before she would take office in January. ‘We really need a big infrastructure bill,’ Miller-Meeks told the Greater Des Moines Partnership. ‘I had expected it before this. I know President Trump had talked about it when he was campaigning.’” [Iowa Capital Dispatch, 9/10/20]
November 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Infrastructure Investment And Jobs Act, Providing $550 Billion In New Infrastructure Spending And Creating Millions Of Jobs

November 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Infrastructure Investment And Jobs Act, Providing $550 Billion In New Infrastructure Spending. In November 2021 Miller-Meeks voted against: “DeFazio, D-Ore., motion to concur in the Senate amendment to the bill that would provide approximately $550 billion in new infrastructure spending, including for surface transportation, broadband, water and energy infrastructure. In supplemental appropriations and increased contract authority, the bill would provide $110 billion for roads, bridges and major surface transportation projects, including $47.3 for highway infrastructure and $40 billion for bridge construction and repair; $66 billion for rail, including $58 billion for Amtrak; and $39 billion for transit, including $5.3 billion for zero- and low-emission transit buses and $2 billion for accessibility improvements. It would provide $25 billion for airports and approximately $17 billion for ports and waterways, including $3.4 billion to modernize land ports of entry and $2.25 billion for water port upgrades, including resilience and electrification projects. It would provide approximately $11 billion for various transportation safety and research programs. It would provide $7.5 billion for electric vehicle charging infrastructure and $5 billion for zero- and low-emission school bus programs. It would establish requirements for many new and existing surface transportation programs to consider the environmental and equity impacts of funded activities and authorize a range of transportation programs related to emissions reduction and climate change resilience. It would provide $1 billion for activities to reconnect neighborhoods by removing or remediating the effects of transportation infrastructure construction in disadvantaged and underserved communities. The bill would provide approximately $65 billion for broadband, including $42.5 billion for grants to states to increase access in unserved areas and $14.2 billion to extend a program initially authorized in response to the coronavirus pandemic that provides stipends to help low-income families pay for internet services. It would provide approximately $62 billion for the Energy Department, including $21.5 billion for clean energy demonstration projects, $16.3 billion for energy efficiency and renewable energy programs, $8 billion for power grid resilience and other electricity projects, and $7.5 billion for fossil energy and carbon management. It would authorize or expand several programs to incentivize clean energy manufacturing, development and adoption. It would provide approximately $55 billion for water infrastructure and safety, including $30.7 billion for the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund, including $15 billion to replace lead service lines and $4 billion to address per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances and other emerging contaminants; and $12.7 billion for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund. Across various departments, the bill would provide funding for climate change response and environmental remediation, including: $11.3 billion for abandoned mine land and water reclamation projects, approximately $5.75 billion for wildfire management, $3.5 billion for the EPA hazardous substance superfund and $3.5 billion for FEMA flood mitigation. It would also provide more than $1.7 billion for cybersecurity resilience programs. The bill would include a number of provisions intended to offset spending, including by rescinding certain unobligated COVID-19 relief funding and establishing tax reporting requirements for cryptocurrency and other digital assets.” The motion was agreed to by a vote of 228-206. [H.R. 3684, Vote #369, 11/5/21; CQ, 11/5/21]

- **White House Projected The $1 Trillion Bipartisan Infrastructure Deal Would Add About 2 Million Jobs Per Year For A Decade.** “The $1 trillion infrastructure plan that now goes to President Joe Biden to sign into law has money for roads, bridges, ports, rail transit, safe water, the power grid, broadband internet and more […] The new law promises to reach almost every corner of the country. It’s a historic investment that the president has compared to the building of the transcontinental railroad and Interstate Highway System. The White House is projecting that the investments will add, on average, about 2 million jobs per year over the coming decade.” [Associated Press, 11/6/21]

- **CNN: Experts Agreed The Infrastructure Spending Was “Sorely Needed To Ensure Safe Travel” And “Efficient Transport Of Goods And Produce.”** “Congress passed a $1.2 trillion infrastructure package Friday, approving a signature part of President Joe Biden's economic agenda. It will deliver $550 billion of new federal investments in America's infrastructure over five years, touching everything from bridges and roads to the nation's broadband, water and energy systems. Experts say the money is sorely needed to ensure safe travel, as well as the efficient transport of goods and produce across the country. The nation's infrastructure system earned a C- score from the American Society of Civil Engineers earlier this year.” [CNN, 11/5/21]
• **Washington Post: Infrastructure Spending Included $16 Billion For “Major Projects That Are Too Large Or Complex For Traditional Funding Programs.”** “The $1.2 trillion infrastructure bill adopted late Friday creates a multibillion-dollar fund to spur the type of complicated, ambitious projects that have been stymied by decades of tentative investment and inattention from Washington. Modern-day equivalents of megaprojects like the Hoover Dam can benefit broad swaths of the United States, but infrastructure experts say they have often stagnated. […] Among the projects that could see a boost: the Gateway rail project, a vast plan to expand capacity for train traffic between New York and New Jersey; and a long-delayed effort to replace the outmoded Brent Spence Bridge connecting Kentucky and Ohio, which is one of the nation’s worst bottlenecks. […] The infrastructure bill includes about $16 billion for ‘major projects that are too large or complex for traditional funding programs,’ but that have big economic benefits, according to the White House.” [Washington Post, 11/6/21]

• **Bipartisan Infrastructure Deal Would Provide $110 Billion For Repairs To Highways, Bridges, And Roads.** “The bill would provide $110 billion to repair the nation’s aging highways, bridges and roads. According to the White House, 173,000 total miles or nearly 280,000 kilometers of America’s highways and major roads and 45,000 bridges are in poor condition. And the almost $40 billion for bridges is the single largest dedicated bridge investment since the construction of the national highway system, according to the Biden administration.” [Associated Press, 11/6/21]

• **Axios: The Infrastructure Bill Included $65 Billion For “Building High-Speed Internet Networks, Helping Low-Income Families Pay For Service And Digital Equity Programs.”** “The infrastructure bill heading to President Biden’s desk includes $65 billion to improve high-speed internet access and affordability. […] By the numbers: The funding is aimed towards building high-speed internet networks, helping low-income families pay for service and digital equity programs. $42.45 billion in grants to states for broadband projects, which can range from network deployment to data collection to help determine areas that lack service. $14.2 billion to provide a $30-a-month voucher to low-income Americans to pay for internet service. It will replace the current $50-a-month Emergency Broadband Benefit program, offering less money monthly, but increasing the number of those eligible. $2.75 billion for digital inclusion and equity projects, such as improving digital literacy or online skills for seniors. $2 billion each for a rural broadband construction program called ReConnect, run by USDA, and to the Tribal Broadband Connectivity Program run by the Commerce Department’s National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA). $1 billion to build so-called ‘middle mile’ infrastructure to connect local providers to larger internet access points. $600 million for private activity bonds to finance broadband deployment projects in rural areas.” [Axios, 11/8/21]

• **The Infrastructure Bill Included $1.75 Billion To Increase The Accessibility Of Transit Systems.** “A $1.75 billion fund in the infrastructure package will aim to guarantee that transit stations are accessible, decades after campaigns by disability rights activists to demand lifts on buses helped to spur passage of the Americans With Disabilities Act. Almost a fifth of transit stations were not fully accessible in 2019, according to the most recent Federal Transit Administration data. […] The bill also includes language about Amtrak, requiring that a person with disabilities be appointed to the railroad’s board and mandating spending on accessibility, which Duckworth said helped show that accessibility was a national issue and not only an urban concern. About 25 million people in the United States report having a disability that limits their transportation options, and the Labor Department attributes lower rates of employment among people with disabilities, in part, to those obstacles. People with disabilities are almost twice as likely as others to use public transit to get around, according to the Transportation Department.” [Washington Post, 11/6/21]

• **Bipartisan Infrastructure Deal Would Invest $44 Billion On Water And Wastewater Infrastructure, Including $15 Billion To Replace Lead Pipes And $10 Billion To Address PFAS Water Contamination.** “The legislation would spend $55 billion on water and wastewater infrastructure. It has $15 billion to replace lead pipes and $10 billion to address water contamination from polyfluoroalkyl substances — chemicals that were used in the production of Teflon and have also been used in firefighting foam, water-repellent clothing and many other items.” [Associated Press, 11/6/21]
Bipartisan Infrastructure Deal Would Invest $65 Billion To Improve The Reliability Of The Power Grid And Boost Clean Power Generation. “To protect against the power outages that have become more frequent in recent years, the bill would spend $65 billion to improve the reliability and resiliency of the power grid. It would also boost carbon capture technologies and more environmentally friendly electricity sources like clean hydrogen.” [Associated Press, 11/6/21]

Bipartisan Infrastructure Deal Would Invest $7.5 Billion In Electrical Vehicle Charging Stations And $5 Billion In Electric And Hybrid School Buses. “The bill would spend $7.5 billion for electric vehicle charging stations, which the administration says are critical to accelerating the use of electric vehicles to curb climate change. It would also provide $5 billion for the purchase of electric school buses and hybrids, reducing reliance on school buses that run on diesel fuel.” [Associated Press, 11/6/21]

Bipartisan Infrastructure Deal Would Invest $66 Billion In Amtrak, The Largest Federal Investment In The Service Since Its Founding. “To reduce Amtrak’s maintenance backlog, which has worsened since Superstorm Sandy nine years ago, the bill would provide $66 billion to improve the rail service’s Northeast Corridor (457 miles, 735 km), as well as other routes. It’s less than the $80 billion Biden — who famously rode Amtrak from Delaware to Washington during his time in the Senate — originally asked for, but it would be the largest federal investment in passenger rail service since Amtrak was founded 50 years ago.” [Associated Press, 11/6/21]


Bipartisan Infrastructure Deal Would Be Funded Through Unspent Pandemic Relief, Unused Federal Unemployment Insurance, And An “Array Of Smaller Pots Of Money.” “The five-year spending package would be paid for by tapping $210 billion in unspent COVID-19 relief aid and $53 billion in unemployment insurance aid some states have halted, along with an array of smaller pots of money, like petroleum reserve sales and spectrum auctions for 5G services.” [Associated Press, 11/6/21]

**Miller-Meeks Called The Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill She Opposed A “Reckless Tax-And-Spend Package”**

Following Her Vote Against The Bill, Miller-Meeks Called The Bipartisan Infrastructure Deal A “Reckless Tax-And-Spend Package.” “U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, R-Iowa, referred to the infrastructure bill passed by the House on Friday as a ‘reckless tax-and-spend package.’ Miller-Meeks, who represents Iowa's Second Congressional District, voted against the $1.2 trillion bill that passed the House by a vote of 228-206. Thirteen Republicans voted with the majority while six Democrats voted against the bill. ‘I have been calling for a fully funded bipartisan bill that would improve our bridges, roads, broadband, locks, dams, broadband and electric grid,’ Miller-Meeks said Friday in a news release. ‘I will not support a bill that is directly tied to a multi-trillion dollar reckless tax-and-spend package that increases inflation and had no Republican input, even though Congress is evenly divided,’ she said. ‘We could have passed a clean infrastructure package already on a bipartisan basis like the Senate did and found reasonable ways to pay for it,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘Instead, the majority decided to play politics and hold good ideas hostage to push through their agenda in a partisan manner,’ she said.” [Quad-City Times, 11/6/21]

Miller-Meeks Claimed She Had Been “Calling For A Fully-Funded Bipartisan Bill That Would Improve Our Bridges, Roads, Broadband, Locks, Dams, Broadband, And The Electric Grid.” “Today, November 5th, 2021, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02) released the following statement after voting NO on the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act: ‘I have been calling for a fully-funded bipartisan bill that would improve our bridges, roads, broadband, locks, dams, broadband, and the electric grid. I will not support a bill that is directly tied to a multi-trillion dollar reckless tax and spend package that increases inflation and had no
Republican input, even though Congress is evenly divided. We could have passed a clean infrastructure package already on a bipartisan basis like the Senate did and found reasonable ways to pay for it. Instead, the majority decided to play politics and hold good ideas hostage to push through their agenda in a partisan manner.” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 11/5/21]

Local Opinion Writers Criticized Miller-Meeks’ “Political Calculation” In Voting Against The Bill

The Cedar Rapids Gazette Editorial Board Was “Disappointed” That Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill Because “Contrary To Those GOP Talking Points, This Is ‘Real Infrastructure.’” “We were disappointed to see the large majority of Republicans in Congress voted against the bill, including all three of Iowa’s GOP House members and one of our GOP senators. ‘The need to make meaningful investments in our nation’s real infrastructure — roads and bridges, locks and dams, and broadband — was sacrificed to advance a partisan, socialist spending spree,’ U.S. Rep. Ashley Hinson said in a news release. Contrary to those GOP talking points, this is ‘real infrastructure.’ Most of the funding in the $1.2 trillion package reflects the so-called spending baseline, meaning it’s money federal bureaucrats already planned to spend on basic infrastructure such as highways that would expire without an extension.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, Editorial, 11/12/21]


Cedar Rapids Gazette’s Todd Dorman: Hinson And Miller-Meeks “Should Have Voted For The Infrastructure Bill” But “Decided To Make A Political Calculation” Because “Denying Democrats A Win Was More Important Than Delivering For Their Districts.” “Hinson and Miller-Meeks should have voted for the infrastructure bill. It’s popular, bipartisan and makes needed investments in Iowa. Instead, they decided to make a political calculation that would keep them in good standing in the Trump GOP. Denying Democrats a win was more important than delivering for their districts. It’s sad, but hardly surprising.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, Todd Dorman, 11/14/21]

PolitiFact Iowa: Despite Voting Against The Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill When It Reached The House, Miller-Meeks Had Said She Supported The Original Senate-Passed Infrastructure Bill

PolitiFact Iowa: “While Miller-Meeks Said She Supported The Original Senate-Passed Infrastructure Bill, She Still Cast Her No Vote” On The Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill. “Dave Loebsack wrote on his existing Twitter account that Hinson and Miller-Meeks denied rural Iowans broadband by voting no on the infrastructure bill. That happened in this instance. And, while Miller-Meeks said she supported the original Senate-passed infrastructure bill, she still cast her no vote on the bill before her.” [PolitiFact Iowa, 11/22/21]

Associated Press: The Infrastructure Investment And Jobs Act “Would Pour More Than $100 Million In Federal Money To Repair And Replace Bridges Into Southwest Iowa”

Associated Press: Miller-Meeks “Voted Against A Bill That Would Pour More Than $100 Million In Federal Money To Repair And Replace Bridges Into Southwest Iowa.” “Davenport’s 81-year-old Centennial Bridge across the Mississippi River creaks under the weight of tens of thousands of cars and trucks every day. Rust shows through its chipped silver paint, exposing the steel that needs replacing. This city’s aging landmark is among more than 1,000 structurally deficient bridges in the area. The tally gives Iowa’s 2nd congressional district the dubious distinction of having the second-most troubled bridges in the country. So, it struck some Iowans as strange when the district’s Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks voted against a bill that would pour more than $100 million in federal money to repair and replace bridges into southwest Iowa. Miller-Meeks objected to majority Democrats’ handling
of the bill, never mentioning its contents, a common refrain from the minority that overwhelmingly opposed it.” [Associated Press, 12/23/21]

**2021: Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District Had The Second-Most Troubled Bridges In The Country, Including Key Bridges Connecting The Quad Cities And A Bridge Linking A Key Freight Route**

Associated Press: Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District Had The Second-Most Troubled Bridges In The Country Of Any District. “Davenport’s 81-year-old Centennial Bridge across the Mississippi River creaks under the weight of tens of thousands of cars and trucks every day. Rust shows through its chipped silver paint, exposing the steel that needs replacing. This city’s aging landmark is among more than 1,000 structurally deficient bridges in the area. The tally gives Iowa’s 2nd congressional district the dubious distinction of having the second-most troubled bridges in the country. So, it struck some Iowans as strange when the district’s Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks voted against a bill that would pour more than $100 million in federal money to repair and replace bridges into southwest Iowa.” [Associated Press, 12/23/21]

1,064 Bridges In Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District, Including Those Connecting The Quad Cities And Linking A Key Freight Route, Have Been Diagnosed As “Structurally Deficient.” “Miller-Meeks had previously asked for money to improve Mississippi River infrastructure. She was among 38 House members from Mississippi River states who wrote to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers on Dec. 9 asking it to prioritize $2.5 billion for modernizing locks and dams. The American Road and Transportation Builders Association diagnosed 1,064 of the bridges — 20% — in Iowa’s agricultural and industrial 2nd district as structurally deficient. That is, provisionally safe but with chronic repair needs. Two of them, including Davenport’s Centennial, cross the Mississippi in the Quad Cities, a mid-sized, industrial metro area of about 475,000 people. The bridges lace Davenport and Bettendorf, Iowa, and Rock Island and Moline, Illinois, a national crossroads of river, rail and highway commerce struggling to maintain its status as a farm machinery hub. Behind Centennial as the most traveled structurally deficient bridge is the 50-year-old Mississippi crossing on Interstate 280, a Davenport bypass that links to Interstate 80, one of the nation’s busiest freight routes.” [Associated Press, 12/23/21]


“Paul Rumler, president of the Quad Cities Chamber of Commerce, lobbied Miller-Meeks to support the infrastructure bill. Commerce slows dramatically during the annual repairs on multiple bridges, he said. In June, the Interstate 280 bridge and the 55-year-old Interstate 80 bridge up river near Davenport were partially closed for repair, pushing westbound traffic back into Illinois for miles. ‘Having a long-term predictable federal infusion of funding is helpful so that we can get out of this day-to-day maintenance and think about long-term needs,’ Rumler said. ‘And the Quad Cities is certainly one of those places that has long-term needs.’” [Associated Press, 12/23/21]

**Associated Press: Miller-Meeks “Objected To Majority Democrats’ Handling Of The Bill, Never Mentioning Its Contents” Instead Of Addressing District Needs**

Associated Press: In Opposing The Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill, Miller-Meeks “Objected To Majority Democrats’ Handling Of The Bill, Never Mentioning Its Contents.” “So, it struck some Iowans as strange when the district’s Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks voted against a bill that would pour more than $100 million in federal money to repair and replace bridges into southwest Iowa. Miller-Meeks objected to majority Democrats’ handling of the bill, never mentioning its contents, a common refrain from the minority that overwhelmingly opposed it.” [Associated Press, 12/23/21]

Associated Press: Miller-Meeks And Other Republicans “Prioritize[d] Their Party’s Line Over District Needs” In The Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill. “So, it struck some Iowans as strange when the district’s Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks voted against a bill that would pour more than $100 million in federal money to repair and replace bridges into southwest Iowa. Miller-Meeks objected to majority Democrats’ handling of the bill, never mentioning its contents, a common refrain from the minority that overwhelmingly opposed it. If anyone in Iowa
was surprised that the Republican would oppose money for a glaring local priority, few in Washington were. Strategists and onetime party leaders note it’s become so common for lawmakers to prioritize their party’s line over district needs that it’s hardly mentioned.” [Associated Press, 12/23/21]

Former NRCC Chair Tom Reynolds Said Miller-Meeks Used “A Company Line” By Tying Her Vote On The Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill To The Build Back Better Act. “I will not support a bill that is directly tied to a multi-trillion dollar reckless tax and spend package,’ she said in the statement. Miller-Meeks and others are offering the procedural explanation, when really they are following the national trend of party loyalty, demonstrating the shift from the time-honored politics of bringing home the bacon, GOP observers said. ‘That’s a company line, as I would call it. I’ve seen that by others,’ said former New York Rep. Tom Reynolds, a former chairman of the National Republican Congressional Committee. ‘Things have changed. It used to be ‘I brought back a number of things for my district.’’” [Associated Press, 12/23/21]

December 2021: Miller-Meeks Joined A Letter Asking For Funds From The Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill To Be Allocated To River Locks And Dams In Iowa


Miller-Meeks Had Voted Against The Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill That Provided The Funding Requested In The Letter. “So, it struck some Iowans as strange when the district’s Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks voted against a bill that would pour more than $100 million in federal money to repair and replace bridges into southwest Iowa. Miller-Meeks objected to majority Democrats’ handling of the bill, never mentioning its contents, a common refrain from the minority that overwhelmingly opposed it. […] Miller-Meeks [sic] had previously asked for money to improve Mississippi River infrastructure. She was among 38 House members from Mississippi River states who wrote to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers on Dec. 9 asking it to prioritize $2.5 billion for modernizing locks and dams. The American Road and Transportation Builders Association diagnosed 1,064 of the bridges — 20% — in Iowa’s agricultural and industrial 2nd district as structurally deficient. That is, provisionally safe but with chronic repair needs.” [Associated Press, 12/23/21]

Miller-Meeks Voted Against The INVEST In America Act That Included More Than $15 Million For Projects In Her District, Including Those She Had Requested Funding For

Miller-Meeks Voted Against The INVEST In America Act, Which Would Authorize More Than $720 Billion In Transportation And Water Infrastructure Projects, Calling It Too Costly

Miller-Meeks Voted Against The INVEST In America Act, Containing More Than $720 Billion In Surface Transportation And Water Infrastructure Spending. In July 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against: “Passage of the bill, as amended, that would authorize more than $720 billion in surface transportation and water infrastructure spending. It would reauthorize federal-aid highway, public transit, rail, and surface transportation safety and research programs for five years, through fiscal 2026, and reauthorize various water infrastructure programs for five or ten years. As amended, the bill would additionally authorize more than $36 billion through fiscal 2026 for activities related to electric vehicle infrastructure, access and manufacturing. It would authorize more than $548 billion through fiscal 2026 for federal surface transportation programs, including $333 billion for federal-aid highway programs; $109 billion for transit programs; and $96 billion for rail programs. It would establish requirements for many new and existing surface transportation programs to consider the environmental and equity
impacts of funded activities. It would require the Transportation Department to establish a number of grant programs for project-level investments, including for carbon pollution reduction projects to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from the surface transportation system; development of electric vehicle charging and hydrogen fueling infrastructure; separation or elimination of highway-rail crossings; extreme weather resilience and mitigation improvements; activities to reconnect neighborhoods by removing or remediating the effects of transportation infrastructure construction in disadvantaged and underserved communities. It would authorize $12 billion for a new program to support large highway, transit, and rail projects of national and regional significance. It would modify a transit grant program to require the procurement of zero-emission buses and other vehicles. Within the total for rail funding, it would authorize $32 billion for Amtrak; $25 billion for a new program to fund improvements to major intercity passenger rail bridges, stations, and tunnels grant; $7 billion for passenger and freight rail infrastructure and safety improvement grants; and up to $20 million annually to establish a university innovation institute to research and develop low- and zero-emission rail technologies. It would establish an independent nonprofit known as the Clean Energy and Sustainability Accelerator to facilitate the deployment of emissions reduction technologies, requiring the Energy Department to transfer $50 billion to the accelerator upon establishment and $10 billion annually for the subsequent five years. The bill would authorize more than $117.5 billion for drinking water infrastructure and $54.4 billion for wastewater treatment infrastructure over ten years. It would authorize $83 billion through 2031 for the EPA Drinking Water State Revolving Fund, which provides grants to states to provide loans and other financial assistance to public water systems, and increase the maximum percentage of such funding states may use to assist disadvantaged communities. It would authorize $4.5 billion annually through fiscal 2031 for grants to states to replace lead service lines; $4 billion available until expended for a low-income drinking water assistance program. It would authorize $40 billion through fiscal 2026 for the EPA Clean Water State Revolving Fund, which provides grants to states to provide loans and other financial assistance related to water treatment infrastructure projects. It would authorize $4 billion for a low-income wastewater assistance program, available until expended. It would authorize $2.6 billion to improve water sanitation facilities funded by the Indian Health Service. It would authorize $500 million annually through fiscal 2031 for community water system PFAS treatment grants. It would require the EPA to set national primary drinking water regulations for contaminants including per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances, microcystin toxin, chromium-6 and 1,4-dioxane.” The bill passed 221 to 201. [HR 3684, Vote #208, 7/1/21; CQ, 7/1/21]

**Miller-Meeks Called The INVEST In America Act Too Costly.** “Republicans, including Miller-Meeks, complained the overarching legislation was too costly, unpaid for and would drive up deficits. ‘(I)t would continue to drive both our deficit and inflation,’” Miller-Meeks said in an interview Friday, arguing the bill lacked details about spending cuts, or ‘pay-fors,’ to account for the new spending and ignored input from House Republicans. ‘Successful legislating requires partnership, not partisanship. And I'll continue to work in that vein.’” [Quad-City Times, 7/2/21]

**Miller-Meeks Wrote An Op-Ed Touting The “Opportunity To Invest In Infrastructure We Have Long Known Was In Need Of Repair” Days After Voting Against Infrastructure Funding**

**Miller-Meeks Op-Ed: Getting The Nation Back To Work After COVID-19 Was “Also An Opportunity To Invest In Infrastructure We Have Long Known Was In Need Of Repair.”** “Iowans have reason to be optimistic. The state and the country are getting back to business, but the reality is the COVID-19 pandemic scarred our economy. Although Iowa businesses are challenged by a lack of workers, nationwide too many people continue to struggle with unemployment. In order to get our economy running at full capacity, it is important we get the nation back to work. It’s also an opportunity to invest in infrastructure we have long known was in need of repair.” [Ottumwa Courier, Mariannette Miller-Meeks Op-Ed, 7/6/21]

**The INVEST In America Act Included More Than $15 Million For Projects In Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District, Many Of Which She Requested Funds For Herself**

**Quad-City Times: Miller-Meeks Voted Against An Infrastructure Deal That Included More Than $15 Million For Projects In Her District.** “Iowa freshman U.S Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks on Thursday joined fellow House Republicans in voting against a $759 billion infrastructure bill, despite the measure including more
than $15 million for trail and road projects in Iowa’s 2nd congressional district.” [Quad-City Times, 7/2/21]

HEADLINE: “Miller-Meeks Votes Against Infrastructure Bill With Earmarks For Iowa’s 2nd District.” [Quad-City Times, 7/2/21]

Miller-Meeks’ Requested Projects Included Funds For Work On Roads, A Regional Transit Facility, And A Bridge Replacement. “The bill designates more than 1,470 projects amounting to nearly $5.7 billion in spending, according to the U.S. House Transportation & Infrastructure Committee. Nearly 1,070 projects worth just under $4 billion were sought by Democrats. Republicans secured 403 projects valued at nearly $1.7 billion. Projects requested by Miller-Meeks included in the House-passed measure include: $9.9 million for the City of Iowa City, on Dodge Street, from Burlington Street north to Governor Street; $2.3 million for the HIRTA Regional Transit Facility in Waukee; $2 million for the Marion County Road G28 corridor; $1.1 million for the Iowa 136 bridge replacement over Elwood Creek 3.1 miles west of US 61 in Clinton County; $900,000 for the Red Rock Prairie Trail in Prairie City. Miller-Meeks said she is supportive of the Iowa projects included in the bill and hopes they will become part of a larger bipartisan infrastructure bill. ‘I continue to support infrastructure,’ Miller-Meeks said, noting she voted against Republican amendments that would have ‘decimated Amtrak,’ which runs through her district. ‘And I'll continue to work on that framework for common-sense projects that can be funded and can be paid for. ... We can work in a bipartisan way. We see that happening in the Senate, and we hope to have similar things continue to happen in the House.’” [Quad-City Times, 7/2/21]

HEADLINE: “Miller-Meeks Votes Against Local Projects She Requested Funds For.” [Iowa Starting Line, 7/6/21]

The House’s Surface Transportation Bill Including $15 Million For Trails And Roads In Miller-Meeks’ District. “Lawmakers will vote on a $715 billion surface transportation infrastructure bill (separate from the plan Biden just negotiated with Senate Republicans). Tucked inside are hundreds of millions of dollars in goodies sought by House Republicans in the form of earmarks, which were revived by House leaders this year after a yearslong ban. […] Roughly half of 22 Republicans in districts being targeted by House Democrats in the midterms requested and received earmarks in the package. They include $20 million each for roads in DAVID VALADAO’S California and DON BACON’S Nebraska districts; $15 million for trails and roads in MARIANNETTE MILLER-MEEKS’ Iowa district; and $19.4 million for JOHN KATKO (N.Y.). and $4 million each for CARLOS GIMENEZ (Fla.).” [Politico Playbook, 7/1/21]

**Miller-Meeks Voted Against Her Own Earmarks**

| 2021: Miller-Meeks Requested A Total Of $36,650,000 In Earmarks |

| 2021: Miller-Meeks Requested A Total Of $36,650,000 In Earmarks For Her District. [Miller-Meeks Community Project Funding website, accessed 12/21/21] |


| Miller-Meeks Voted Against H.R. 4502. [H.R. 4502, Vote 247, 7/29/21] |
$2 Million In Community Project Funding Was Approved For Miller-Meeks’ Community Project Funding Request For Indian Hills Community College In The LHHS Subcommittee Appropriations Bill

Miller-Meeks Requested $5 Million In Community Project Funding For Indian Hills Community College. “Proposed recipient: Indian Hills Community College Recipient address: 525 Grandview Avenue, Ottumwa IA 52501 Requested amount: $5,000,000” [Office Of Rep. Miller-Meeks, Accessed 7/30/21]

- $2 Million In Community Project Funding Was Approved For Indian Hills Community College In The Labor, Health And Human Services, Education, And Related Agencies Subcommittee Appropriations Bill. [House Appropriations Committee, Accessed 7/30/21]

Miller-Meeks’ Two Approved Sewer Project Requests Totaed $4.2 Million

Miller-Meeks Requested $1.7 Million In Community Project Funding For The City Of Burlington’s Sewer Separation Project. “Proposed recipient: City of Burlington Recipient address: 400 Washington Street, Burlington, IA 52601 Requested amount: $1,700,000 Explanation of request: The requested funds will allow the City of Burlington to complete additional sewer separation and road work.” [Office Of Rep. Miller-Meeks, Accessed 7/30/21]

- $1.7 Million In Community Project Funding Was Approved For The City Of Burlington’s Sewer Separation Project In The Interior, Environment, And Related Agencies Subcommittee Appropriations Bill. [House Appropriations Committee, Accessed 7/30/21]

Miller-Meeks Requested $2.5 Million In Community Project Funding For The City Of Ottumwa’s Blake’s Branch Sewer Project. “Proposed recipient: City of Ottumwa Recipient address: 105 East Third Street, Ottumwa, IA 52501 Requested amount: $2,500,000 Explanation of request: The Blake’s Branch Sewer project is a piece of the City of Ottumwa’s continued efforts to meet federal and state mandates to remedy the Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) throughout the City.” [Office Of Rep. Miller-Meeks, Accessed 7/30/21]

- $2.5 Million In Community Project Funding Was Approved For The City Of Ottumwa’s Blake’s Branch Sewer Project In The Interior, Environment, And Related Agencies Subcommittee Appropriations Bill. [House Appropriations Committee, Accessed 7/30/21]

Miller-Meeks’ Four Approved Transportation And Housing And Urban Development Requests, Including Highway Construction And Bridge Replacement Projects, Totaed $4.2 Million

Miller-Meeks Requested $1 Million For The Reconstruction Of Iowa Highway 38 In Tipton. “Proposed recipient: City of Tipton Recipient address: City Hall, 407 Lynn Street, Tipton, IA 52772 Requested amount: $1,000,000 Explanation of request: The project request is for the first two of three phases of the reconstruction of Iowa Highway 38, which is also known as Cedar Street. This is Tipton's "Main Street."” [Office Of Rep. Miller-Meeks, Accessed 7/30/21]

- $2 Million In Community Project Funding Was Approved For The Reconstruction Of Iowa Highway 38 In Tipton In The Transportation, Housing And Urban Development, And Related Agencies Subcommittee Appropriations Bill. [House Appropriations Committee, Accessed 7/30/21]

Miller-Meeks Requested $850,000 For The Mahaska/Oskaloosa Driving Economic Success (MODES) Planning Study. “Proposed recipient: Mahaska County Recipient address: 2074 Old Highway 163 Oskaloosa, Iowa 52577 Requested amount: $850,000 Explanation of request: The City of Oskaloosa, with the support of Mahaska County, seek Community Project Funding from Congress to help fund the public-private project, dubbed Mahaska/Oskaloosa Driving Economic Success (MODES) Planning and Environment Linkages (PEL) study and a
streamlined Environmental Assessment (EA) for a new roadway that will provide improved regional and local access in rural east central Iowa.” [Office Of Rep. Miller-Meeks, Accessed 7/30/21]

• $850,000 In Community Project Funding Was Approved For The MODES Planning Study In The Transportation, Housing And Urban Development, And Related Agencies Subcommittee Appropriations Bill. [House Appropriations Committee, Accessed 7/30/21]

Miller-Meeks Requested $600,000 For The Scott County Bridge Replacement Project. “Proposed recipient: Scott County Secondary Roads Department Recipient address: 950 E. Blackhawk Trail, Eldridge, Iowa 52748 Requested amount: $600,000 Explanation of request: The Scott County Secondary Roads Department seeks Community Project Funding from Congress for a bridge replacement project located at 250 feet northeast of 18378 Wells Ferry Road, Pleasant Valley, IA 52767. This bridge is on the National Bridge Inspection system and considered structurally deficient.” [Office Of Rep. Miller-Meeks, Accessed 7/30/21]

• $600,000 In Community Project Funding Was Approved For The Scott County Bridge Replacement Project In The Transportation, Housing And Urban Development, And Related Agencies Subcommittee Appropriations Bill. [House Appropriations Committee, Accessed 7/30/21]

Miller-Meeks Requested $750,000 For The Iowa City Transit Operations And Maintenance Facility. “Proposed recipient: Iowa City Transit/City of Iowa City Recipient address: 410 E Washington Street, Iowa City, IA 52240 Requested amount: $750,000 Explanation of request: Community Project Funding is requested for completing the design phase for the new Iowa City Transit Operations and Maintenance Facility (‘Transit Facility’).” [Office Of Rep. Miller-Meeks, Accessed 7/30/21]

• $750,000 In Community Project Funding Was Approved For The Scott County Bridge Replacement Project In The Transportation, Housing And Urban Development, And Related Agencies Subcommittee Appropriations Bill. [House Appropriations Committee, Accessed 7/30/21]

Miller-Meeks’ Approved Energy And Water Development Request Was $22.5 Million For The Upper Mississippi River Navigation And Ecosystem Sustainability Program

Miller-Meeks Requested $22.5 Million For The Upper Mississippi River – Navigation And Ecosystem Sustainability Program. “Proposed recipient: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Rock Island District Recipient address: 1500 Rock Island Dr, Rock Island, IL 61201 Requested amount: $22,500,000 Explanation of request: NESP has widespread bipartisan support from the five states on the UMRS and the support of industry, America’s building trades, and environmental groups. Therefore, we are requesting full funding of NESP’s construction for FY 22. NESP has a total FY 22 construction-ready capability of $22.5 million.” [Office Of Rep. Miller-Meeks, Accessed 7/30/21]

The Upper Mississippi River NESP Funding Was Included In The Energy And Water Development Subcommittee Appropriations Bill. “It is those last two connections the pair celebrated last week with news that their bipartisan request for $22.5 million for lock and dam — as well as environmental — renovations on the Mississippi River had passed the Appropriations Committee as part of the 2021 funding bill for Energy and Water Development. The project would breathe life into the Upper Mississippi River Navigation and Ecosystem Sustainability Program, which had sat stagnant for years. […] ‘This is absolutely a crucial issue for our river economies,’ said Hinson during her weekly call with Iowa press on Friday. ‘This is about safety, expediency, efficiency and making sure we have viable ways to get our products to market. The entire country is dependent upon the river economy of the Mississippi River. It’s a huge win for the Midwest, specifically Iowa’s farmers and ag producers.’” [Telegraph Herald, 7/18/21]

Jan. 2021: Miller-Meeks Tweeted About “The Importance Of Passing A Much Needed Infrastructure Bill To Rebuild/Enhance Our Infrastructure On The Mississippi River.” “An informative tour of Lock 14 in Pleasant Valley alongside @MikeNaigIA this Friday afternoon. It showcases the importance of passing a much needed
infrastructure bill to rebuild/enhance our infrastructure on the Mississippi River. Thank you for having us! #ia02” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 1/29/21]

**Miller-Meeks Voted Against Infrastructure Funding She Requested For Her District Days Before Writing An Op-Ed Touting The “Opportunity To Invest In Infrastructure We Have Long Known Was In Need Of Repair”**

**HEADLINE:** “Miller-Meeks Votes Against Infrastructure Bill With Earmarks For Iowa's 2nd District.” [Quad-City Times, 7/2/21]

Miller-Meeks Voted Against An Infrastructure Deal That Included More Than $15 Million For Projects In Her District. “Iowa freshman U.S Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks on Thursday joined fellow House Republicans in voting against a $759 billion infrastructure bill, despite the measure including more than $15 million for trail and road projects in Iowa’s 2nd congressional district.” [Quad-City Times, 7/2/21]

Miller-Meeks Op-Ed: Getting The Nation Back To Work After COVID-19 Was “Also An Opportunity To Invest In Infrastructure We Have Long Known Was In Need Of Repair.” “Iowans have reason to be optimistic. The state and the country are getting back to business, but the reality is the COVID-19 pandemic scarred our economy. Although Iowa businesses are challenged by a lack of workers, nationwide too many people continue to struggle with unemployment. In order to get our economy running at full capacity, it is important we get the nation back to work. It’s also an opportunity to invest in infrastructure we have long known was in need of repair.” [Ottumwa Courier, Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 7/6/21]

**Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Build Back Better Act, Which Would Reduce Costs For Iowans, Justifying Her Opposition With Multiple False Or Questionable Criticisms**

**Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Build Back Better Act**

**November 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Build Back Better Act.** On November 19, 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against the “Passage of the fiscal 2022 budget reconciliation bill, as amended, that would provide approximately $2 trillion in investments and tax cuts to address climate change and child care, health care, education, housing and other social policies intended to support families. It would establish a child care and early learning entitlement program, providing approximately $100 billion for the program through fiscal 2024. It would provide $18 billion through fiscal 2024 for a free universal preschool program. It would extend through 2022 the expanded child tax credit provided by prior coronavirus relief law (PL 117-2) and provide $5 billion to administer the credit. It would establish a paid family and medical leave benefit for up to four weeks per year, beginning in 2024. It would require the Health and Human Services Department to negotiate a "maximum fair price" for insulin and select Medicare-eligible, brand-name drugs that do not have generic competition. It would require manufacturers to provide rebates for single-source drugs under Medicare Parts B and D for which prices increase faster than inflation. For Medicare Part D, it would cap annual out-of-pocket limit at $2,000 beginning in 2024. It would establish or extend expanded eligibility for certain tax credits toward Affordable Care Act marketplace insurance premiums through 2025. It would establish or expand a number of tax credits to incentivize actions by businesses and individuals to mitigate climate change, including to expand credits for renewable energy production and facilities, carbon capture facilities, use of alternative fuels and energy efficiency improvements at residential properties; and to establish individual credits for the purchase of electric vehicles. It would raise royalty rates and fees for oil and gas drilling leases and cancel or ban certain offshore leases. It would provide $29 billion to support the deployment of low- and zero-emission technologies, more than $20 billion for federal climate resiliency and environmental conservation activities and $9 billion for federal procurement of electric vehicles and related infrastructure. It would provide $65 billion for public housing improvements, $24 billion for rental assistance housing vouchers and $15 billion for down payment assistance and loan programs for first-generation homebuyers. It would provide $9.8 billion for local transit projects to support mobility and affordable housing access disadvantaged communities and $9 billion for lead remediation and water line replacement projects. It would...
forgive all debt owed by the National Flood Insurance Program’s debt, for a total of $20.5 billion. It would provide such sums as necessary for the USDA to forgive farm loan debt for economically distressed farmers and ranchers. It would provide $6.6 billion to the Small Business Administration and Minority Business Development Agency to help underrepresented individuals with business development. It would provide $20 billion for Labor and Education department workforce development programs and $1.9 billion for Labor Department worker protection agencies. It would allow individuals who entered the United States prior to Jan. 1, 2011, to receive a grant of parole allowing them to remain temporarily in the country for a period of five years, but no later than Sept. 30, 2021. It would temporarily increase from $10,000 to $80,000 the annual cap on the deduction for state and local taxes for tax years 2021 through 2030. To offset costs, it would establish or modify various taxes on corporations and high-income individuals, including to establish a 15 percent alternative minimum tax for corporations with an annual income exceeding $1 billion; a one percent tax on stock buybacks by public companies; and an additional five percent tax on individual income over $10 million and further three percent tax on income over $25 million. It would provide $78.9 billion to improve IRS operations and tax enforcement.” Passed by a vote of 220-213. [HR 5376, Vote 385, 11/19/21; CQ, 11/19/21]

- **Roosevelt Institute: Build Back Better Act Would Invest In Child Care, Creating Jobs And Allowing Parents To Get Back To Work.** “Convenient, affordable childcare is a major obstacle for working parents, illuminated even more so by school and daycare closures during the COVID-19 pandemic, which has disproportionally impacted women’s labor force participation. Increasing the capacity of industries in order to curb inflation of specific prices requires increasing the supply of labor. The Build Back Better Act invests in existing and new childcare facilities in underserved areas and provides subsidies to make childcare more affordable for qualifying households. Together, these investments would increase the supply of childcare, create new jobs, and allow parents to get back to work. [Roosevelt Institute, Fact Sheet, 9/28/21]

- **Center For American Progress: Build Back Better Act Would Invest In Clean Electricity And Energy Efficiency, Reducing Energy Costs By $500 Per Year For The Average Household.** “Build Back Better helps break the United States’ dependence on fossil fuels—an industry that’s particularly vulnerable to extreme weather, which has and will continue to be exacerbated by climate change—consumer energy costs will be reduced. Specifically, proposed investments in clean electricity and energy efficiency will make energy costs more affordable, saving the average household approximately $500 a year in reduced energy costs. This much-needed investment in clean energy would come at a time when energy prices have pushed up inflation for consecutive months.” [Center for American Progress, 11/16/21]
  
  - E&E News: The Budget Resolution Set “The Stage For Unprecedented Investments To Tackle Climate Change And Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions.” “Senate Democrats unveiled a $3.5 trillion budget resolution this morning, setting the stage for unprecedented investments to tackle climate change and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.” [E&E News, 8/9/21]

- **The Build Back Better Deal Lowered Drug Prices For Seniors By Reducing Co-Pays And Establishing A $2,000 Out-Of-Pocket Limit in Medicare Part D.** “Pelosi celebrated the drug-pricing agreement: ‘For a generation, House Democrats have been fighting to deliver real drug price negotiations that will lower costs. With today’s agreement on strong lower drug price provisions for the Build Back Better Act, Democrats have a path forward to make good on this transformational agenda for our seniors.’ She said the deal will lower drug prices for seniors, reduce their out-of-pocket co-pays and establish a $2,000 out-of-pocket limit for seniors’ expenses in Medicare Part D. The bill would also halt price hikes above inflation, which would affect all Americans, she said.” [NBC News, 11/2/21]

• FactCheck.Org: “In The First Year Of Biden’s Proposed Budget, 2022, Nearly Nine Out Of 10 Households Would See A Tax Cut.” “In the first year of Biden’s proposed budget, 2022, nearly nine out of 10 households would see a tax cut, according to the Tax Policy Center.” [FactCheck.org, 9/24/21]


• PolitiFact: Tax Increases In The Build Back Better Act Were “Aimed At People Making More Than $400,000” And “Large Corporations.” “While there could be some costs to middle and working class families, the tax increases in proposed reconciliation bills have been aimed at people making more than $400,000 large corporations [sic]. Those making could see a tax increase when tax rates enacted during the Trump Administration are to expire in 2025.” [PolitiFact, 11/8/21]

Miller-Meeks: Democrats’ Budget Resolution Was “Reckless And Unfair To The American Taxpayer.” “Average Americans are already paying higher prices at the grocery store and gas pump. With the current inflation crisis, a $3.5 trillion spending spree that is hardly paid for is reckless and unfair to the American taxpayer. #IA02” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 8/24/21]

Miller-Meeks: Proposed Spending And Tax Increases Were “Extremely Troublesome Given That We’ve Seen The Economy Slow Down.” HOST: “I want to begin with something that Rich Edson touched on, how there is some significant disagreement between the parties over how this is going to get paid for, Republicans wanting to use unused COVID money, but then Democrats making it very clear that they want, as Senator Bernie Sanders has said, progressive taxation. How confident are you that any sort of bipartisan agreement can be met here?” MILLER-MEEKS: “Well, certainly you have senators working on a bipartisan agreement, and right now, their solution is a $1 trillion package without the tax increases, but then also in the background is floating another $6 trillion in spending which would have tax increases with it. And reports are the largest tax increase since 1968. So that's extremely troublesome given that we've seen the economy slow down. The economy was primed to take off as people got vaccinated. So, it's very worrisome and I think you indicated earlier, the Monmouth poll, it's showing that the majority of people are concerned about inflation, and they're feeling it every single day.” [YouTube, Fox News, 6/19/21] 00:00:13

Miller-Meeks Falsely Claimed BBB Would Cause Inflation, But The Bill Was Set To Ease Inflationary Pressures

Miller-Meeks Was Concerned That Democrats’ Budget Would Put The Country In Economic Jeopardy And Create Inflation. “Miller-Meeks is prepared to vote for the infrastructure plan, but — as for the larger spending bill — she is concerned that it would put the country in economic jeopardy. ‘When you’re chasing too much, you have inflation. We’ve already seen inflation … People aren’t feeling the effect of having an increase in their salary, because it’s costing them more to buy food,’ Miller-Meeks said.” [Daily Iowan, 10/17/21]

Economists At Leading Rating Agencies Said The Build Back Better Agenda Would Not Add To Inflationary Pressures. “U.S. President Joe Biden’s infrastructure and social spending legislation will not add to
inflationary pressures in the U.S. economy, economists and analysts in leading rating agencies told Reuters on Tuesday.” [Reuters, 11/16/21]

17 Nobel Laureate Economists Signed A Letter Saying That Biden’s Economic Agenda Would Ease Inflationary Pressures. “Biden promised Friday the bills would lower costs. In the long-term, many economists agree. For example, 17 Nobel laureates in economics signed a letter saying Biden’s policies would ‘ease longer-term inflationary pressures.’ Many of Biden’s investments — roads and transit, building more affordable homes, lower drug costs and reducing child care costs — should result in a more productive economy and lower prices.” [Washington Post, 11/7/21]

Miller-Meeks Cited Incomplete CBO Score In Claiming Build Back Better Act Would Increase The Deficit

Miller-Meeks Cited CBO Score In Claiming Build Back Better Act Was “Not Fully Paid For, Doesn’t Cost Zero, And Will Increase The Deficit.” “The CBO estimated the 10-year cost of the bill to be $1.68 trillion. Biden and Democrats had touted the bill as costing $1.85 trillion. ‘The CBO has now said what we have known for months: this package is not fully paid for, doesn’t cost zero, and will increase the deficit,’ Miller-Meeks said in a statement. ‘We must go back to responsible spending and bipartisan solutions to build a brighter future for the next generation.’” [Des Moines Register, 11/19/21]

- Miller-Meeks: “CBO Says Even With Tax Increases [Build Back Better Act] Will Still Cost ~ $400 B.” “@RepMMM Past the 4:30 am mark and @GOPLeader McCarthy still going strong. The country is too important so he is preventing Dems from voting on behemoth of bill that CBO says even with tax increases will still cost ~ $400 B. About to break Pelosi’s record. We’re with you Kevin!” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 11/19/21]

- Des Moines Register: CBO Score Miller-Meeks Cited “Does Not Account For Revenue The Government Could Receive As A Result Of Stronger IRS Enforcement Of Tax Laws.” “Republicans blasted the legislation, saying it would add to the nation’s deficit. An estimate from the Congressional Budget Office found the bill would increase the deficit by about $367 billion over the next decade. But that estimate does not account for revenue the government could receive as a result of stronger IRS enforcement of tax laws. The Biden administration believes stricter enforcement will bring in about $400 billion in additional revenue over a decade, while the CBO estimates it would raise about $207 billion.” [Des Moines Register, 11/19/21]

Miller-Meeks Repeatedly Criticized The Procedural Handling Of The 2021 Budget Reconciliation

Miller-Meeks Said The Build Back Better Act “Had No Republican Input, Even Though Congress Is Evenly Divided.” “I will not support a bill that is directly tied to a multi-trillion dollar reckless tax-and-spend package that increases inflation and had no Republican input, even though Congress is evenly divided,” she said. “We could have passed a clean infrastructure package already on a bipartisan basis like the Senate did and found reasonable ways to pay for it,” Miller-Meeks said. “Instead, the majority decided to play politics and hold good ideas hostage to push through their agenda in a partisan manner,” she said.” [Quad-City Times, 11/6/21]

Miller-Meeks: Using Reconciliation And The Threat Of Ending The Filibuster To Pass A $6 Trillion Spending Package Was “Going To Come Back To Haunt” Democrats And “Undermine[d] Bipartisanship.” HOST: “I do want to hit on this $6 trillion spending package the Democrats are floating, because really, they want to go big right now while they feel they can, and Chuck Schumer saying that, you know, they'll use reconciliation if necessary. It's their one last shot this year. But how much will that go toward any goodwill that's being built, that's been built by this bipartisan group of senators this week?” MILLER-MEEKS: “You know, I think that really undermines bipartisanship. You know, the country has an appetite for bipartisanship where it makes common sense and where it's practical. But you know, when you think of what happened during the election, and their very slim majority in the House, and, you know, a tie in the Senate, which is of course broken by the Vice President, they don't have a huge mandate, but yet, their policies are if they have a huge mandate, and then using, you know, both reconciliation and the threat of ending the filibuster in order to get things passed, I think, is really going to come
back to haunt them. But it does undermine bipartisanship and the desire to work together, especially on infrastructure.” [YouTube, Fox News, 6/19/21] 00:03:24

**Miller-Meeks Campaigned On Preserving The Tax Cuts & Jobs Act**

**Miller-Meeks Campaigned In 2020 On Preserving The 2017 Republican Tax Cuts**

November 2020: Cedar Rapids Gazette Reported That Miller-Meeks Had Campaigned On Preserving The 2017 Republican Tax Cuts. “Miller-Meeks, an ophthalmologist, former director of the Iowa Department of Public Health and a retired lieutenant colonel in the U.S. Army, has said she will fight for skills training and apprenticeships to prepare Iowa's workforce for the 21st Century, fair trade deals that allow Iowans to compete around the globe, and economic solutions that will strengthen the U.S. economy and increase Iowan's take-home pay, including preserving the 2017 Republican tax cuts.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 11/4/20]

**March 2021: Cedar Rapids Gazette Gave Tax March’s Claim That Miller-Meeks Supported Tax Breaks For Billionaires A “D” Grade Due To Her Not Being Seated In Congress For Votes On The Trump Tax Cuts**

March 2021: Cedar Rapids Gazette's Fact Check Gave Tax March’s Claim That Miller-Meeks Supported Tax Breaks For Billionaires A “D” Grade Due To Her Not Being Seated In Congress For Votes On The Trump Tax Cuts. “Claim 2: 'Even though there's only one billionaire in Iowa, Mariannette Miller-Meeks supports giving billionaires huge tax breaks for private jets and yachts.' According to Forbes' interactive billionaire map, Iowa's only billionaire is Harry Stine, the founder of Stine Seeds. Stine lives in Adel, which is not part of Miller-Meeks' district. The ad cites a 2018 Business Insider article about former President Donald Trump's tax plan allowing private jet buyers to deduct 100 percent of the cost from their taxes. Miller-Meeks was not in Congress when the tax bill became law in 2017 and therefore did not vote on it and likely had no say on the private jet and yacht tax breaks. Nikki Haley, the former U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, said Oct. 21 while campaigning with Miller Meeks that the Ottumwa Republican would work to preserve the Trump tax cuts, according to a Quad-City Times article. Trump's tax reform law had many components to it, so that doesn't necessarily mean she supports 'huge tax breaks' for private jets and yachts. We give this claim a D.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 3/1/21]

February 2021: Tax March Called Out Miller-Meeks For Her Opposition To Biden’s COVID-19 Relief Package While Still Supporting Trump Tax Cuts For Billionaires And Corporations. “A new ad campaign led by the progressive group Tax March calls out Iowa U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, R-Iowa, for her opposition to President Joe Biden’s $1.9 trillion COVID relief package. Miller-Meeks last week voted against a budget resolution that could clear the way for Biden’s coronavirus relief package. Miller-Meeks, in a statement following her vote, criticized Democrats for pushing forward ‘partisan issues such as a national $15/hour minimum wage, which would kill thousands of jobs across the country and in southeastern Iowa, and bailouts for state governments, such as Illinois, who have mismanaged their budgets,’ rather than working in a bipartisan manner to address the pandemic and ‘deliver real, targeted relief for our constituents.’ The new ad, which will air in southeast Iowa's 2nd Congressional District, is part of a multistate campaign aimed at pressuring members of Congress to back Biden's plan. The #ReliefNOW campaign calls for 'full, fast and fair relief’ to help struggling Iowans pay rent and medical and utility bills, and feed their families. Tax March, in a news release, argues Miller-Meeks 'is leaving Iowa families who need massive economic relief high and dry,” while standing firm in her commitment to protecting the Trump tax cuts for billionaires and corporations.” [Quad-City Times, 2/10/21]

**Miller-Meeks Said She Supported Extending The Bush Tax Cuts**

**2015: Miller-Meeks Shared A Tweet That Said “& For Billionth Time It Wasn't W's Tax Cuts That Led To The Recession But Absurd Policies On Affordable Housing”**
2015: Miller-Meeks Shared A Tweet That Said “& For Billionth Time It Wasn't W's Tax Cuts That Led To The Recession But Absurd Policies On Affordable Housing.” “Yes MT RT @DavidLimbaugh : & for billionth time it wasn't W's tax cuts that led to the recession but absurd policies on affordable housing” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 2/9/15]

2010: Miller-Meeks Said She Supported Extending The Bush Tax Cuts

Miller-Meeks Supported Extending The Bush Tax Cuts. “Miller-Meeks called the allegation that she would raise taxes ‘slightly ludicrous,’ saying she didn't know any Republican who would run on that platform. Instead, Miller-Meeks said that instituting a fair tax would make the process simpler, eliminate loopholes and increase compliance. She said there needs to be a comprehensive discussion about tax policy, and that it was irresponsible for Congress to wait until the last minute to decide whether to extend the Bush tax credits when they had known for four years they would expire at the end of 2010. She accused Loebsack of switching his position to one that was more favorable during this election cycle. Congress adjourned before voting on the tax cuts.” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 10/13/10]

Miller-Meeks Said She Did Not Want To Raise Corporate Taxes Because “Taxes On Investment Hurts All Of Us”

June 2021: Miller-Meeks Said She Did Not Want To Raise Taxes On Corporations Because “Taxes On Investment Hurts All Of Us”

NIEDLEMAN: “You just mentioned how Republicans are drawing that line in the sand that an infrastructure deal can’t raise taxes, specifically on corporations, and that would force the president's two trillion dollar-plus proposal to be cut, essentially, in about half. But yet, the Institute on Taxation and Economic Policy found 55 of the largest corporations paid no taxes for their most recent fiscal year, and they put a price on that tax avoidance at $12 billion. So, why aren't Republicans trying to force corporations to pay income taxes and perhaps pay for that infrastructure? Are you okay with that?” MILLER-MEEKS: “Well, I think you can certainly look at the tax code and the tax structure to determine you know, how you pay taxes, what gets paid in taxes, and then we have to be very mindful that taxes on investment hurts all of us because that money gets invested into companies, to businesses, to venture capital, to entrepreneurs, which helps create jobs and grow our economy. So, you know, we know that there are taxes that are harmful and don't help grow an economy, that don't create jobs. And then we know that there is a taxation level at which most of us agree is fair.” [YouTube, Local 4 News WHBF, 6/20/21] (VIDEO)

June 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted For An Amendment That Requires Companies To Disclose What They Would Pay If Corporate Taxes Increase

In June 2021, Miller-Meeks voted for: “Burgess, R-Texas, amendment no. 1 that would require publicly traded companies, if the federal corporate tax rate increases, to disclose what payments they would have made if the rate remained the same as it was on June 1, 2021.” The amendment was rejected 204 to 218. [H R 1187, Vote #164, 6/16/21; CQ, 6/16/21]

2014: Miller-Meeks Said She Favored Cuts To Corporate Income Taxes

2014: Miller-Meeks Said She Favored Cuts To Corporate Income Taxes. “Miller-Meeks resigned from her position as director of the public health agency to again try to unseat four-term Democratic Rep. Dave Loebsack. While campaigning, she has stressed her military career and experience in health care. She said both have given her
a unique position to understand issues such as the treatment of service men and women at Veterans Affairs hospitals. She favors cuts to corporate income taxes and a reduction in regulations.” [Telegraph Herald, 6/4/14]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Tweet/Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Miller-Meeks Tweeted “We Should Go ‘Canada’ In Past Decade: Lowered Ind &amp; Corporate Taxes, Trade Agreements &amp; Domestic Energy Prod”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Miller-Meeks Tweeted “We Should Go ‘Canada’ In Past Decade: Lowered Ind &amp; Corporate Taxes, Trade Agreements &amp; Domestic Energy Prod.” “[NPR_Not_Neutral @pdcanada1 We should go ‘Canada’ in past decade: lowered ind &amp; corporate taxes, trade agreements &amp; domestic energy prod” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 2/23/13]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Miller-Meeks Tweeted “We Should Go ‘Canada’ In Past Decade: Lowered Ind &amp; Corporate Taxes, Trade Agreements &amp; Domestic Energy Prod.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2010: Miller-Meeks Said She Supported “Reducing The Second Highest-In-The-World Corporate Income Tax Rate.”

2010: Miller-Meeks Said She Supported “Reducing The Second Highest-In-The-World Corporate Income Tax Rate.” According to Miller-Meeks for Congress 2010 website Miller-Meeks wrote “Support reducing the second highest-in-the-world corporate income tax rate. Cutting the tax rate from 35% to 20% will unleash a tidal wave of new economic activity, resulting in millions of new good paying jobs and fantastic technological innovations that put us on a strong path to a brighter economic future.” [Miller-Meeks for Congress 2010, accessed 6/15/20]

2008: Miller-Meeks Said Lowering The Corporate Tax To 20 Percent Would Help The Economy And The Lost Money Would Be Made Up From Increased Production

2008: Miller-Meeks Said Lowering The Corporate Tax To 20 Percent Would Help The Economy And The Lost Money Would Be Made Up From Increased Production And More People Working And Paying Taxes. “Another economic issue is the corporate tax. The U.S. has the second highest rate in the world. Miller-Meeks said lowering that to 20 percent would help the economy. The lost money from lowering the tax would be made up through more production and more people working and paying taxes.” [Daily Democrat, 5/1/08]

Miller-Meeks Repeatedly Argued Against Taxing The Estates Of Multi-Millionaires


Miller-Meeks Op-Ed: Repealing Stepped-Up Basis Would “Force Heirs To Sell All Or Parcels Of Farmland To Pay Large Taxes On Assets That They Simply Cannot Afford To Pay Off.” “Recently, there was movement in Congress to eliminate the stepped-up basis at death on capital gains. Stepped-up basis is the modification of the value of an appreciated asset for tax reasons once inherited. In plain English, a stepped-up basis adjusts the value of an asset when it passes from an owner to their heir. […] Many farmers have most of their assets tied up in the family farm because the costs associated with running a farming operation are so high. Eliminating the step-up in basis would force heirs to sell all or parcels of farmland to pay large taxes on assets that they simply cannot afford to pay off when a transfer through inheritance occurs.” [Iowa Torch, Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 9/21/21]

August 2021: Miller-Meeks Tweeted “The Death Tax Has Hurt Family Farms Across Iowa For Years And Doubling Down On This Will Hurt Them Even More”

August 2021: Miller-Meeks Tweeted “The Death Tax Has Hurt Family Farms Across Iowa For Years And Doubling Down On This Will Hurt Them Even More.” “Well said by @SenJohnThune in @FoxNews. The death tax has hurt family farms across Iowa for years and doubling down on this will hurt them even more. #IA02 #IowaAg” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 8/11/21]
2012: Miller-Meeks Said She LIked The Idea Of Abolishing The Estate Tax

2012: Miller-Meeks Said She Liked The Idea Of Abolishing The Estate Tax. “Like this idea! RT @coryjcrowley: Newt: abolish death tax because it is immoral. #iacaucus #bold ideas” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 1/2/12]

Miller-Meeks Consistently Undermined Medicare Benefits And Viability And Opposed Allowing Medicare To Negotiate Drug Prices

2021: Miller-Meeks Said She Opposed Allowing Medicare To Negotiate Lower Prescription Drug Prices, But Claimed A Month Later She Was “Still Working” On Lowering Drug Prices

Miller-Meeks Said She Opposed Allowing Medicare To Negotiate Lower Prescription Drug Prices. “Republican Congresswoman Mariannette Miller-Meeks of Ottumwa says she’s opposed to having the federal government negotiate to lower the prices of prescription medicine covered by Medicare. Democrats have inserted this proposal in a bill that may be voted upon today.” [Radio Iowa, 11/5/21]


Retired Physician David Sands Op-Ed: By Opposing Allowing Medicare To Negotiate Drug Prices, Miller-Meeks Was “Hurting Iowans And People Across The Country For Strictly Political Purposes.” “Dr. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, who is my representative in Congress, uses Republican talking points to justify an utterly untenable position against allowing Medicare to negotiate prices with pharmaceutical companies. I am also a physician (retired) and I have to call out Miller-Meeks for hurting Iowans and people across the country for strictly political purposes.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, David Sands, 11/22/21]

Miller-Meeks Compared Medicare Negotiating Drug Prices To The Afghanistan Withdrawal And That “If You Think That It Went Just Swimmingly, Then Of Course You Want President Biden And His Team To Negotiate Prices For You On Drugs.” MILLER-MEEKS: “If I may, an example of that is, look at the Afghanistan withdrawal. And so, if you think that it went just swimmingly, then of course you want President Biden and his team to negotiate prices for you on drugs. If you don't think it went very well, then maybe we need to rethink how much of the government we want controlling that.” [YouTube, Kevin McCarthy, 11/5/21] (VIDEO) 00:29:15

December 2021: Miller-Meeks Said She Was “Still Working” On “Lowering Prescription Drug Prices.” “MILLER-MEEKS: We’re still working on prescription, lowering prescription drug prices. So I think, given the things that I’ve done, I expect to be reelected and by a much larger margin that six votes.” [YouTube, Iowa Press, 12/17/21] (VIDEO) 00:06:19

2021: Miller-Meeks Falsely Claimed That Government Involvement In Drug Pricing Would Lead To Rationing Of Care And Restricted Access To Medications

Miller-Meeks Said Allowing The Government To Control Drug Prices Would Lead To “Rationing Of Care” And Access To Prescription Drugs Based On “How Valuable Your Life Is.” MILLER-MEEKS: “And that is that in countries where there is government control of pricing, and there is that disparity, they also utilize your access to drugs or medications or surgery through a lens of quality-adjusted life years. And so, what this does—and think about this, if you have a child who’s born with a rare disease, or a debilitating disease, or you're an individual that develops a cancer and you're at 70 years old, rather than 30 years old, the government that is going to determine your access to care by what they value your life. And so, if you're a senior citizen, the value of your life is less than if you were a young adult, and in the United States, are we ready to have--in essence, this is rationing of
care. It's not, you know, it is not a scare tactic. This is precisely what will be done on the basis of how valuable your life is. And constitutionally, we know that we don't have any second-class citizens. But this sets us up to divide Americans apart into whose life is more valuable, so who gets access to treatment and who gets access to drugs, and I think it is such a discriminatory practice.” [YouTube, Kevin McCarthy, 11/5/21] (VIDEO) 00:37:46

KFF: Claims That Medicare Drug Price Negotiation Would Restrict Access To Certain Medicines Were “Not Accurate.” “The pharmaceutical industry’s latest ad campaign claims that drug price negotiation would ‘restrict access to medicines in Medicare’ by removing ‘a provision that protects access to medicines’ and that patients ‘would be stuck with whatever medicines the government says you can have.’ Another drug industry ad says that allowing the government to negotiate drug prices means ‘politicians…[will] decide which medicines you can and can’t get.’ This is not accurate. In fact, the proposed drug price negotiation program does not authorize the federal government to decide which medications people on Medicare can and cannot get and does not establish or require a particular prescription drug formulary. Insurers that offer Medicare prescription drug plans would continue to make decisions about which drugs to cover, or not, subject to protections provided under current law and regulations. The legislation under consideration leaves in place the non-interference clause and its specific restrictions with the exception of the proposed drug price negotiation program. Under this program, the negotiation process would not apply to most prescription drugs, instead focusing on a relatively small number with the highest spending and lacking generic or biosimilar competitors.” [KFF, 10/7/21]

2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Legislation Preventing Medicare Cuts, Saying The Bill Was A “Short-Term Fix”

December 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Preventing Sequestration Cuts To Medicare And Establishing Procedures To Expedite Senate Consideration Of A Debt Limit Increase. On December 7, 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against the “Passage of the bill, as amended, that would extend from Dec. 31, 2021, to March 31, 2022, a temporary suspension of the 2 percent annual sequester of Medicare payments, and provide for payment reductions of 1 percent for the period of April 1 through June 30, 2022. As an offset, it would increase sequestration percentages above 2 percent in fiscal 2030. It would also require budget year debit for 2022 to be rolled over to the 2033 scorecards under statutory pay-as-you-go requirements, thus delaying spending cuts to Medicare and other mandatory programs subject to sequestration that would otherwise be triggered in January. It would delay a number of other Medicare payment reductions and policies, including to extend a temporary increase in payment amounts for physicians to provide a 3 percent increase for services furnished in 2022; delay for one year a provision that would phase in payment reductions for clinical diagnostic laboratory tests, prohibiting any reductions for 2021 and 2022 and prohibiting reductions greater than 15 percent for 2023 through 2025; and delay through 2022 the implementation of the Medicare radiation oncology model. It would decrease from $165 million to $101 million funding that may be expended from the Medicare Improvement Fund for fiscal 2021. Finally, the bill would establish procedures to expedite Senate consideration of a joint resolution to increase the debt limit by a specific dollar amount. Specifically, it would provide for a non-debatable motion to proceed to the joint resolution and, if the motion is agreed to, up to 10 hours of debate on the measure with no amendments or other motions in order, immediately followed by a vote on passage. Such procedures would be valid for consideration of one joint resolution by Jan. 16, 2022.” Passed by a vote of 222-212. [S. 610, Vote 404, 12/7/21; CQ, 12/7/21]

- Miller-Meeks Said She Voted Against Preventing Medicare Cuts Because Democrats Chose “A Short-Term Fix” And “Directly Tied It To A Debt Limit Increase.” “Today, December 7th, 2021, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02) released the following statement after voting NO on an inadequate fix to Medicare sequestration: ‘Today, I voted no on the Democrat majority’s heavy-handed decision to play political games with Americans’ healthcare and businesses. Medicare patients need and deserve access to quality care and providers. After months of fair negotiations, the majority has chosen a short-term fix to Medicare sequestration and has directly tied it to a debt limit increase. Ensuring patients have access to care and that there are options for quality providers needs to be a top priority. Instead of kicking the can down the road, Congress should be staying in Washington until a long-term bipartisan solution is agreed upon to avoid cuts to Medicare. These political games are unacceptable and the American people deserve better. I look forward to working with
my colleagues to address this issue in a permanent and constructive manner.’” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 12/7/21]

2020: 39,257 Residents Of Iowa’s 2nd District Received Some Medicare Benefits

2020: 39,257 Residents Of Miller-Meeks’ District Received Medicare Benefits. [Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, 2020 Congressional District Report]

2012: Miller-Meeks Supported Voucher Plan for Medicare

Miller-Meeks Supported Voucher Plan for Medicare. According to Miller-Meeks twitter, she stated “Agree! RT @texmed: Alabama Dr. Jeff Terry: Medicare premium support “may not be politically correct, but it is medically correct.” #AMAmtg” [@miller-meeks, Twitter, 6/17/12]

The Program Miller-Meeks Supported Would Replace Medicare Insurance Coverage By Giving Medicare Recipients A Fixed Dollar Amount To Buy Insurance On The Private Marketplace

The Miller-Meeks’ Supported Program Would Replace Medicare Insurance Coverage By Giving Medicare Recipients A Fixed Dollar Amount To Buy Insurance On The Private Marketplace. “The ad also references a tweet Miller-Meeks made supporting a Medicare Premium Support program in Paul Ryan's 2012 budget proposal. That program would replace Medicare insurance coverage by giving Medicare recipients a fixed dollar amount to buy insurance on the private marketplace. The Congressional Budget Office released a report in 2013 that looked at two models for a premium support program. Depending on the model used, the report showed costs to beneficiaries could rise 11 percent or fall 6 percent. Both models showed a net savings in taxpayer spending on Medicare. [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 10/4/14]

2009: Miller-Meeks Questioned The Need To Provide Current Levels Of Medicare Benefits If It Required Increasing Taxes

Miller-Meeks: “Just Like Fannie Mae And Freddie Mac, It's A Government-Sponsored Entity […] If Medicare Is Underfunded, In Order To Provide The Current Level Of Benefits That We Provide To Seniors, Then How Much Taxation Do People Want To Pay For That?” “Miller-Meeks, however, says that's a false argument. She said insurance companies have to worry about a bottom line, whereas the government can increase taxes. 'Just like Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, it's a government-sponsored entity,' Miller-Meeks said. ‘If Medicare is underfunded, in order to provide the current level of benefits that we provide to seniors, then how much taxation do people want to pay for that?’’” [The Hawk Eye (Burlington, Iowa), 9/6/09]

Miller-Meeks: “The Mere Fact That We Have Insurance Causes Costs To Rise.” “Providers in the healthcare system see this all the time, when someone else is paying the bill, you purchase things that you would not have when you are paying for them out of your own pocket. So the mere fact that we have insurance causes costs to rise.
In addition to that, as consumers and constituents, we've asked our legislators within our states to add on more benefits to our health insurance.” [Mariannette Miller Meeks Conversation on Health Care, 9/4/09]

**Miller-Meeks Blamed Medicare Funding Shortfalls On Overuse, Saying Seniors With Sore Throats Should Gargle Salt Water Rather Than Use The Health Care System Unnecessarily**

Miller-Meeks Blamed Medicare Funding Shortfalls On “Overuse, Saying Those Who Get Care For Free Are Prone To Use It Unnecessarily Like Patients With Mild Sore Throats Who'd Otherwise Would Gargle With Salt Water.” “Mariannette Miller-Meeks, a nonpracticing ophthalmologist in Ottumwa, agrees with the ideal of health care for all, but says the proposed legislation doesn't do accomplish that task. […] To begin tackling the myriad problems of the current health care system, Miller-Meeks proposes changing Medicare reimbursement, something finds support with Maharry and much of Iowa's federal delegation. Blocking that, though, are the more populous states have more representatives in Congress who support status quo. Compounding the problem, the Medicare fund is running out of money. Miller-Meeks blames the bankruptcy on overuse, saying those who get care for free are prone to use it unnecessarily like patients with mild sore throats who'd otherwise would gargle with salt water.” [The Hawk Eye (Burlington, Iowa), 9/6/09]

Miller-Meeks Blamed The Rise Of Health Care Costs On Medicare Overuse. “Two words, competition and insurance. If you look at the cost of health care in the United States, the rapid rise began in 1970. And the rise in health care costs exceeded inflation. This is because Medicare was instituted in 1965. As seniors became more adept at utilizing the Medicare system to pay for care that they previously had not accessed, the cost escalated. We also know from numerous health care studies […] show that when someone doesn't bear the cost of health care, they utilize more. So overutilization began to be the norm.” [Mariannette Miller Meeks Conversation on Health Care, 00:00:28, 9/4/09] (VIDEO)

**2009: Miller-Meeks Appeared To Support Phasing Out The Funding Stream For Medicare And Social Security**

Miller-Meeks Said The Government Could Gradually Phase Out The Employer Deduction. “The problem with that, Miller-Meeks admits, is that each state has different coverage requirements. So she proposes ending that practice and requiring coverage just for the three things she believes people fear most. Miller-Meeks said the government also could gradually phase out employer deduction but offer individuals the same deduction so they could choose their best means of care.” [The Hawk Eye (Burlington, Iowa), 9/6/09]

- The Employer Deduction Funds Social Security And Medicare. “The current tax rate for social security is 6.2% for the employer and 6.2% for the employee, or 12.4% total. The current rate for Medicare is 1.45% for the employer and 1.45% for the employee, or 2.9% total. Refer to Publication 15, (Circular E), Employer's Tax Guide for more information; or Publication 51, (Circular A), Agricultural Employer’s Tax Guide for agricultural employers.” [IRS, 2/14/20]

**2010: Miller-Meeks Supported Cutting “Spending And Root Out Well Known And Documented Waste In Entitlement Programs Like Medicare And Medicaid”**

Miller-Meeks Supported Cutting “Spending And Root Out Well Known And Documented Waste In Entitlement Programs Like Medicare And Medicaid.” According to Miller-Meeks for Congress 2010 website under “Cut Spending, Cut Government Waste”, Miller-Meeks stated “while both Republicans and Democrats are responsible for years of past budget deficits, together, we must be the solution for future generations who will inherit this massive legacy of debt. We need to enact a balanced budget amendment, afford the President line-item veto authority, cut spending and root out well known and documented waste in entitlement programs like Medicare and Medicaid which add up to tens of billions of dollars every single year.” [Miller-Meeks for Congress 2010, accessed 6/15/20]
2008: Miller-Meeks Wanted To Raise Iowa’s Medicare Reimbursement Rate

“Miller-Meeks said she wants to raise Iowa’s Medicare reimbursement rate and move health care coverage to a free-market, consumer driven system.” [The Hawk Eye, 5/27/08]

Miller-Meeks: “I Will Fight To Preserve/Protect [Medicare] In Congress”

According to Dr. Miller-Meeks twitter account, Miller-Meeks stated “Today we celebrate Medicare's 49th Anniversary - a promise we made to our seniors. I will fight to preserve/protect the program in Congress.” [Dr. Miller-Meeks Twitter, 7/30/14]


December 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Raising The Debt Limit By $2.5 Trillion. On December 14, 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against the “Passage of the resolution that would increase the statutory limit on federal debt by $2.5 trillion.” The bill passed by a vote of 221-209. [S. J. Res. 33, Vote 449, 12/15/21; CQ, 12/15/21]

- HEADLINE: “House Passes Debt Ceiling Increase, Sending It To Biden To Avoid Default Hours Before Deadline.” [CNBC, 12/15/21]

- Congress Passed A Debt Limit Increase Early The Day The Debt Limit Would Have Been Reached. “Congress early Wednesday voted to raise the nation's debt limit by $2.5 trillion, officially staving off default and the economic peril that would come if the U.S. were unable to pay its bills. […] Lawmakers managed to get the measure passed just in time to avoid an economic scare. Treasury Secretary Janet Yellen told lawmakers she estimated the United States would reach its debt ceiling by Wednesday. If lawmakers didn't address the debt limit by then, the U.S. would have defaulted on its debts for the first time, which could lead to a global recession, Treasury Department officials and experts said.” [USA Today, 12/15/21]

- Washington Post: Failing To Raise The Debt Limit Threatened $20 Billion In Social Security Payments For Seniors. “If Congress fails to increase the debt limit, Treasury would be unable to pay debts as they come due. Treasury Secretary Janet L. Yellen said earlier this week that such a default would be unprecedented in U.S. history. Moody’s ‘best estimate’ is that this date is Oct. 20, although Treasury has not given a more precise day. At that point, Treasury officials would face excruciating choices, such as whether to fail to pay $20 billion owed to seniors on Social Security, or to fail to pay bondholders of U.S. debt — a decision that could undermine faith in U.S. credit and permanently drive federal borrowing costs higher.” [Washington Post, 9/21/21]
October 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against A Resolution To Concur In A Senate Amendment Of The Debt Limit Suspension Bill. On October 12, 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against the “Adoption of the resolution (H Res 716) that would provide for floor consideration of the Family Violence Prevention and Services Improvement Act (HR 2119), the Providing Urgent Maternal Protections for Nursing Mothers (PUMP) for Nursing Mothers Act (HR 3110) and the Protect Older Job Applicants (POJA) Act (HR 3992). It would provide for floor consideration of eight amendments to HR 2119; two amendments to HR 3110; and two amendments to HR 3992, as well as up to one hour of general debate on each bill. It would also provide for automatic agreement to a motion to concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the debt limit suspension bill (S 1301)” [CQ, 10/12/21; H. Res. 716, Vote 315, 10/12/21]

September 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against A Bill To Raise The Debt Ceiling Through December 2022. On September 21, 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against the “Passage of the bill that would provide funding for federal government operations and services through Dec. 3, 2021, at fiscal 2021 levels; provide emergency funding for natural disaster relief and Afghan evacuee assistance; and suspend the statutory limit on federal debt through Dec. 16, 2022.” [CQ, 9/21/21; H.R. 5305, Vote 267, 9/21/21]

Miller-Meeks Joined A Letter Opposing Any Effort To Raise The Debt Ceiling. “U.S. Reps. Randy Feenstra, R-Iowa, and Mariannette Miller-Meeks, R-Iowa, joined over 100 of their colleagues in signing an open letter to the American people, opposing any effort by congressional Democrats to raise the debt ceiling. Last month, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimated Congress will need to raise the debt limit by October or November. Negotiations to raise the debt ceiling have historically been bipartisan, but as the letter states, Democrats control Congress and the White House, and have used this as an opportunity to pass trillions of dollars in unprecedented spending.” [Iowa Torch, 9/2/21]

… Despite Campaigning On Protecting The Financial Security Of Social Security Beneficiaries

2020: Miller-Meeks’ Campaign Spokesman Said Miller-Meeks “Is Not Going To Support Any Legislation That Will Jeopardize” The Financial Security Of Social Security Beneficiaries. “Miller-Meeks' campaign said she will fight to strengthen and protect Social Security and Medicare. 'Rita Hart is using the same old, tired scare tactic about Social Security and Medicare that we hear from Democrats every election year,’ campaign spokesman Eric Woolson said in an emailed statement. 'Mariannette Miller-Meeks knows what it's like to grow up in a poor family that struggles to make ends meet. She knows that Social Security is a safety net and a lifeline for millions of Americans, including members of her own family and many friends. She is not going to support any legislation that will jeopardize their financial security.’” [Quad-City Times, 9/16/20]

122,943 Retired Workers In Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District Received $190,303,000 In Total Monthly Medicare Benefits

2020: 166,364 Individuals In Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District Were Medicare Beneficiaries. [Social Security Administration, accessed 1/7/22]

• 2020: 130,157 Seniors In Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District Were Medicare Beneficiaries. [Social Security Administration, accessed 1/7/22]

• 2020: 122,943 Retirees In Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District Were Medicare Beneficiaries. [Social Security Administration, accessed 1/7/22]

2020: Medicare Beneficiaries In Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District Received $238,713,000 In Total Monthly Benefits. [Social Security Administration, accessed 1/7/22]

• 2020: Retired Workers In Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District Received $190,303,000 In Total Monthly Medicare Benefits. [Social Security Administration, accessed 1/7/22]
WHO 13 Des Moines: “On Money Matters, Republican Mariannette Miller-Meeks Supports Looking At Raising The Retirement Age To Ease The Strain On The Social Security System.” “On money matters, Republican Mariannette Miller-Meeks supports looking at raising the retirement age to ease the strain on the Social Security system. Democrat Rita Hart doesn’t. Hart wants to raise the federal minimum wage but didn’t say by how much. Miller-Meeks thinks the states should determine the minimum wage. Miller-Meeks said, ‘A minimum wage is…and I started out 30 cents an hour…so a minimum wage is an entry-level. It’s not supposed to be a wage or was not meant to be a wage that is supposed to support a family.’” [WHO 13 Des Moines, 9/25/20]

2014: Miller-Meeks Said Future Solutions For Benefits Could Include The Possibility Of Raising The Federal Retirement Age. “Miller-Meeks, an eye surgeon and former director of the Iowa Department of Public Health, in a prior run for the seat in 2014, said for the U.S. to prevent sharp breaks in the benefit or tax levels faced by succeeding generations, solutions could include the possibility of raising the federal retirement age of 65.” [Quad-City Times, 9/16/20]

2010: Miller-Meeks Supported Raising The Federal Retirement Age. “Miller-Meeks said the United States must recognize that there is a risk of backlash from young workers if they come to the conclusion they pay for the benefits and programs geared toward older Americans but will not have similar benefits after they retire. Her solution is not to cut existing benefits but to take steps to adjust the situation to prevent the costs from overwhelming the future workforce. That includes stopping the federal government from raiding accounts like the Social Security trust fund for unrelated projects and the possibility of raising the federal retirement age. ‘We cannot keep asking more and more of younger people for programs that politicians have guaranteed for older Americans,’ Miller-Meeks said.” [Ottumwa Courier, 8/25/10]

2008: Miller-Meeks Supported Raising The Retirement Age. According to a 2008 Project Vote Smart questionnaire, Miller-Meeks supported raising the retirement age for individual eligibility to receive full Social Security benefits. [Vote Smart, Accessed 6/22/20]

2020: Miller-Meeks Called For A Federal Balanced Budget Amendment, Which Would Raise Problems For The Operation Of Social Security

Miller-Meeks: “We Have A Balanced Budget Amendment In The State Of Iowa And I Think There Should Be A Balanced Budget Amendment At The Federal Level.” “Miller-Meeks fielded questions from business representatives on a variety of topics. (Hart will have a similar session at 10 a.m. Oct. 22). The sessions were arranged by the Partnership, Young Professionals Connection and the Greater Des Moines Leadership Institute. […] ‘I do not agree with closing the economy to handle the pandemic. I think we need to learn from this. When it comes to handling the federal debt, you can either decrease spending, or you can increase revenue. I do think we
need to look at our spending levels and where we spend money. Do we have a return on investment? Do the programs we have in place do what they were intended to do? Do they have an outcome? Do we have an outcome measure? … We have a balanced budget amendment in the state of Iowa and I think there should be a balanced budget amendment at the federal level.”” [Iowa Capital Dispatch, 9/10/20]

CBPP: A Federal Balanced Budget Amendment Would “Threaten Significant Economic Harm” And “Raise A Host Of Problems For The Operation Of Social Security And Other Vital Federal Programs.” “A balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution would be an unusual and economically dangerous way to address the nation’s long-term fiscal problems. It would threaten significant economic harm, as explained below. It also would raise a host of problems for the operation of Social Security and other vital federal programs. It’s striking that the House Republican leadership intends to schedule a vote on a balanced budget amendment just a few months after the President and Congress enacted a tax cut that will increase deficits by as much as $2 trillion over the next decade.[1] The economic problems with such an amendment are the most serious. By requiring a balanced budget every year, no matter the state of the economy, such an amendment would raise serious risks of tipping weak economies into recession and making recessions longer and deeper, causing very large job losses. The amendment would force policymakers to cut federal programs, raise taxes, or both when the economy is weak or already in recession — the exact opposite of what good economic policy would advise. That’s because the amendment would force policymakers to cut federal programs, raise taxes, or both when the economy is weak or already in recession — the exact opposite of what good economic policy would advise.” [Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, 3/16/18]

2008: Miller-Meeks Supported Privatizing Social Security

Miller-Meeks Supported “Some Sort Of Private, But Limited, Account For Some Of The [Social Security] Funds.” “Another large entitlement program that could use some help is Social Security, Miller-Meeks said. There are some simple solutions that can extend the life of the program. […] She also sees that it is difficult for congressmen to keep their hands off Social Security funds when money is needed elsewhere. For that reason, she supports some sort of private, but limited, account for some of the funds. She said the private account most likely could earn better than the 3 percent the government gains.” [Daily Democrat, 5/1/08]

2008: Miller-Meeks Supported Private Accounts. According to a 2008 Project Vote Smart questionnaire, Miller-Meeks supported allowing workers to invest a portion of their payroll tax on private accounts that they manage themselves. [Vote Smart, Accessed 6/22/20]

2014: Miller-Meeks Said She Would Protect Social Security

Miller-Meeks Said She Would Protect Social Security. “Both candidates said they would protect Social Security, although they argued about Loebrock’s record on Medicare. Miller-Meeks said he voted to cut Medicare more than once.” [The Quad-City Times, 10/12/14]
Miller-Meeks: “I Will Fight To Preserve And Protect Social Security To Help Current Retirees And Families Going Through Difficult Times.” “Mariannette Miller-Meeks, R: My husband’s father suffered for nearly a decade with prostate cancer that took a devastating toll on his family. After he passed away, survivors benefits through Social Security helped them make ends meet. In Congress, I will fight to preserve and protect Social Security to help current retirees and families going through difficult times. The challenge with the program is long-term solvency that needs to be addressed in a bipartisan way that should be above politics. We need to have an open dialogue about ways to preserve and protect the program for current and future retirees.” [Des Moines Register, 9/7/14]
Miller-Meeks: “It’s Difficult As A Woman To Face This Issue. I’m Also Catholic, I Am Pro-Choice, But It’s A Very Sensitive Issue.” At a forum hosted by Ottumwa Women’s League of Voter, Miller-Meeks said “It’s difficult as a woman to face this issue. I’m also Catholic, I am pro-choice, but it’s a very sensitive issue.” [Ottumwa League Of Women Voters, 5/31/18] (VIDEO) 00:00:43

Miller-Meeks Said Abortion Discussions Were Best Left To Providers, Doctors, And Patients. At a forum hosted by Ottumwa Women’s League of Voter, Miller-Meeks said “I think these are decisions that are best left to providers, to doctors and to patients. I don’t want the government in my health care decisions. And I think that that’s why it’s a good thing to bring it up and to be challenged. But it is a very personal issue.” [Ottumwa League Of Women Voters, 5/31/18] (VIDEO) 00:01:21

Miller-Meeks Said Roe V. Wade Was “Only Temporary. This Is Only Until Women Have Access To Birth Control.” “In 1973 as I had mentioned to you all last session I had left home at 16 to find a way to put myself through college and medical school. So in 1973 when Roe v. Wade was decided, at that time in Texas what we said was ‘this is only temporary. This is only until women have access to birth control.’” [Iowa State Senate Floor, 2/13/20] (VIDEO) 00:00:00

Miller-Meeks: “Young Women Have Available Resources, Both For Birth Control And The Educational Wherewithal To Be Able To Prevent Pregnancy.” At a forum hosted by Ottumwa Women’s League of Voter, Miller-Meeks said “When I talk to people I can tell you, women may support it or not supported but they don’t think that abortion should be used as birth control. We need to continue to educate. We need to make sure that young women have available resources, both for birth control and the educational wherewithal to be able to prevent pregnancy.” [Ottumwa League Of Women Voters, 5/31/18] (VIDEO) 00:01:34

Miller-Meeks Said She Was “Lobbied Heavily By Constituents” To Vote Against The Constitutional Amendment But Voted In Favor Of The Amendment “Because That’s What I Believed In.” At a Marion County GOP Congressional Forum, Miller-Meeks said “Well I think you’re there-the party, and we’ve talked about the party platform earlier, represents a set of values. So within those set of values you vote in accordance with them. You are also there to represent your district, but I would disagree in saying that you vote purely by your district. And I’ll give you an example. I’m in a Democrat senate district. When we passed the constitutional amendment, the life amendment, to the constitution and I spoke on the floor about the amendment, I was lobbied heavily by constituents in my district to vote against it. I had many more people contact me to vote against it than to vote for it. So if I had gone along with my district I would have voted against it but I voted for it because that’s what I believed in. So it would not have mattered what my party wanted, and I voted against my district because I’m in a Democrat district, but I voted my value system and beliefs. So I think as much as you can you’re trying to do it within your belief and values system and in accordance with what you have been elected to represent with your platform and your party.” [Marion County GOP Congressional Forum, 00:43:00, 5/14/20] (VIDEO)

Miller-Meeks’ Statement Was In Response To The Question Of Whether She Would Work For The GOP Or The Citizens Of Iowa’s 2nd District In DC. At a Marion County GOP Congressional Forum, Miller-Meeks was asked “I believe that most of the people that have been elected to go to Washington vote mainly party. Both Pelosi and McCarthy have the uncanny ability to whip their members into line. And so we very rarely see disagreements from within the party. I believe that it’s the candidates responsibility to represent the people of the district are elected to and not just represent the party. We need to work with the people of our district and represent what they want us to do.” [Marion County GOP Congressional Forum, 00:41:00, 5/14/20] (VIDEO)
Big Lie & Election Law

Miller-Meeks: “There Were Irregularities” In The 2020 Presidential Election And “There Were States That Violated Their Own Legislative Codes. And That’s Something That I Think Can Be Looked At And Should Be Looked At.” PRICE: “But did fraud cost him the election or not?” MILLER-MEEKS: “I’d say that there were irregularities and that there were states that violated their own legislative codes. And that’s something that I think can be looked at and should be looked at. And I think states should be very proactive in looking at how they can improve their election system.” [YouTube, WHO13, 11/7/21] (VIDEO) 00:06:08

November 2021: Miller-Meeks: “Because Of The Election Law Changes We Have Made In Iowa In The Past Three Years, People In Iowa Can Trust That Our Elections Are Fair.” MILLER-MEEKS: “But one thing I can say is because of the election law changes we have made in Iowa in the past three years, people in Iowa can trust that our elections are fair, they can have confidence and trust in our process, and that both parties when they talk about either on one party talking about voter suppression if you ask for voter ID, the other party saying--and I think over the weekend I heard Stacey Abrams and Terry McAuliffe running for governor of Virginia talk about the election was stolen from Stacey Abrams in Georgia when she ran for governor--that on both sides, that undermines confidence in our election system. And we need to have trust in, you know, both our election system and institutions of government that are there to help people. In Iowa, I know that we can have trust and confidence in our election system because of the changes we've made over the past three years. Other states are also putting in some election integrity measures and security measures. And those laws have been opposed and denigrated, and I don't think that's helpful for all of us. You know, to me, how do you answer election fraud? If you think there's fraud, the way to answer it, get out to vote, get out to vote in huge numbers. So, people need to turn out to vote, they need to turn out to vote in overwhelming support for the candidate that they choose to support.” [YouTube, WHO13, 11/7/21] (VIDEO) 00:04:47

Miller-Meeks Said Voter ID Laws Were “Highly Supported By The Public” And That “Iowans Can Have Great Confidence And Trust In Their Election System.” “HOST: A recent Iowa poll showed that 32% of Iowans and almost half of Iowans who voted for Donald Trump say they are not confident that the next election results will be, that they can trust the next election results. So there is obviously an attitude out there about a lack of confidence in our elections that has been building off of this. What will it take to lower those numbers, especially given that every review, legal challenge, etc., non-partisan reviews, has shown that the election was conducted fairly and legally? What will it take to convince those Americans that these elections can be trusted? MILLER-MEEKS: Well I think one thing that’s not helpful is to have a bill going though Congress that is put forward by the majority party to get rid of voter ID. The election bill that now is, they’re looking at perhaps changing that in the Senate, and concentrating on the election bill rather than on Build Back Better because at this point in time they don’t have the votes to pass that through the Senate. That getting rid of voter ID, which is highly supported by the public, so you have over 70% of the public supports voter ID. We have voter ID here within the state of Iowa, and if you look at our elections here within the state of Iowa I think Iowans can have great confidence and trust in their election system. So we have put through election law changes in order to secure elections and precisely for that reason, so that people have the confidence that their vote counts. And if anything could tell you your vote counts, it would be my election. So I am probably the poster child. But I think what we did with election law changes, the fact that our voter ID was upheld by our Supreme Court, and then we were told for absentee ballot requests that we needed to codify those changes, those changes were codified. I think in Iowa people can have trust and faith in their elections.” [YouTube, Iowa Press, 12/17/21] (VIDEO) 00:10:10 - 00:12:23

- Miller-Meeks Said That While She Did Not Think Mail-In And Absentee Ballots Needed To Be Eliminated, She Did Support Iowa’s Requirement Of Requiring Driver’s License Or Voter Identification Numbers. “HOST: So much of when those complaints or concerns are raised a lot of it is often around mail-in voting, absentee, early voting. Can we still have that system in place and be able to convince people that that is a safe and fair way to conduct elections? Or do you think mail-in voting needs to be constrained if not eliminated? MILLER-MEEKS: I don’t think it needs to be eliminated, I think the process that we have in Iowa where you request a mail-in ballot or you have an absentee ballot request and you request it and then you have
your signature and you have either your driver's license number or your voter identification number, that process I think works extremely well in Iowa and it’s well accepted by the public. And then being able to mail in the ballots, and because we have codified what’s expected, people know it’s expected in Iowa. So we know that your ballot has to be postmarked or barcoded, and had to adapt to that. We had to adapt to changes in postal service delivery. But it has to be barcoded or it has to be postmarked by the day before the election.” [YouTube, Iowa Press, 12/17/21] (VIDEO) 00:12:23 – 00:13:54

- **Miller-Meeks: “And If You’re Concerned About Election Fraud, The Best Thing Do Is To Get More People Out To Vote.”** “HOST: A recent Iowa poll showed that 32% of Iowans and almost half of Iowans who voted for Donald Trump say they are not confident that the next election results will be, that they can trust the next election results. So there is obviously an attitude out there about a lack of confidence in our elections that has been building off of this. What will it take to lower those numbers, especially given that every review, legal challenge, etc., non-partisan reviews, has shown that the election was conducted fairly and legally? What will it take to convince those Americans that these elections can be trusted? MILLER-MEEKS: Well I think one thing that’s not helpful is to have a bill going through Congress that is put forward by the majority party to get rid of voter ID. The election bill that now is, they’re looking at perhaps changing that in the Senate, and concentrating on the election bill rather than on Build Back Better because at this point in time they don’t have the votes to pass that through the Senate. […] But I think what we did with election law changes, the fact that our voter ID was upheld by our Supreme Court, and then we were told for absentee ballot requests that we needed to codify those changes, those changes were codified. I think in Iowa people can have trust and faith in their elections. And if you’re concerned about election fraud, the best thing to do is to get more people out to vote. So get out to vote in bigger and greater numbers.” [YouTube, Iowa Press, 12/17/21] (VIDEO) 00:10:10 - 00:12:23

- **Miller-Meeks Said Campaigns Could “Reach Out To Individuals” And Follow Up To Address Concerns Following Iowa’s Adoption Of Requiring Ballots Arrive To The County Auditor’s Office By Election Day.** “HOST: Actually the new law is that it has to be in the county auditor’s office on election day. MILLER-MEEKS: Yeah. So I think those, because this just cam in our most recent iteration of election law changes, and there are other states that have that as well. But knowing that I think helps people to know what they have to do, campaigns can reach out to individuals and they can follow up on that and make sure people understand the law. But I don’t think mail-in ballots or absentee ballot requests with a mail-in ballot should be eliminated.” [YouTube, Iowa Press, 12/17/21] (VIDEO) 00:12:23 – 00:13:54

- **Miller-Meeks: Iowans Losing Faith In The Voting System “Can Have Confidence And Trust In The Election System Within Iowa” With The Implementation Of “Safeguards” To Prevent Fraud.** “HOST: So just before we move on, what would be your message to those, that 32% of Iowans, half of the Iowans who voted for Donald Trump, who don’t have faith in the current system, what would your message be to them? MILLER-MEEKS: My message would be that they can have confidence and trust in the election system within Iowa. We have put safeguards in place to both prevent fraud, even though it’s usually extremely low and is very difficult to prove, and that if they’re concerned about fraud, get more people out to vote.” [YouTube, Iowa Press, 12/17/21] (VIDEO) 00:13:54 - 00:14:20

**Miller-Meeks Said She Would Combat Voter Fraud With Mail-In Voting By Making Sure States Have Control Over Elections While Speaking At A Republican Candidate Forum.** At a Johnson County GOP Candidate Forum Miller-Meeks was asked “How would you combat voter fraud with mail-in voting?” .Miller-Meeks said “It’s interesting because in the CARES Act, the Democrats and Nancy Pelosi were trying to put in provisions about voting by mail. And so I think it’s very important that we be mindful. Constitutionally elections are the province of the state. So we need to make sure that states have domain over elections and that they’re state run. We in Iowa are fortunate to have a voter ID law that was stood up by our Supreme Court, so we know that our Voter ID law is constitutional. And over the past two years we have worked very hard in the legislature to try to reduce the early voting time. They did get that reduced.” [Johnson County GOP Candidate Forum, 00:04:23:34, 4/24/20] (VIDEO)
2019: Miller-Meeks Said She Supported An Individual’s 2nd Amendment Rights “So That They Can Support Themselves Against A Government That Becomes Tyrannical.” “I believe the 2nd Amendment to be an individual right and that citizens have the right to bear arms per our constitution so that they can support themselves against a government that becomes tyrannical.” [YouTube, Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 11/14/19] (VIDEO) 00:00:13

COVID-19

Miller-Meeks: “We Have Known For Over A Year That Children Don’t Transmit The Virus.” MACDONALD: “Major push back now against Dr. Fauci. He says children age 2 or older should wear masks, but the WHO says children under age 5 don’t need to wear masks. There’s a lot of confusion about this. What do you say to this?” MILLER-MEEKS: “It’s the same reason why there’s vaccine hesitancy and that’s because we continue to get mixed messages from the so-called experts. So, the WHO has said children under 5 don’t need to wear masks. Even as far back as almost a year ago, the American Journal of Pediatrics had published that children don’t transmit. So, children up to the elementary school age, so that would be up until 6th grade, don’t transmit the virus to other children or to adults. Children get the virus from other adults, but they weren’t transmitting it. And that may be because they have a better immune system and a better T-cell immune system, but nonetheless, we have known for over a year that children don’t transmit the virus.” [Fox Business, 7/14/21] (VIDEO) 00:00:57

Miller-Meeks: “To Say We’re Not Going To Let Children Go Back To School Unless They’re Wearing Masks Is Not Following The Science.” “We have known for over a year that children don’t transmit the virus. So delaying children going to summer camps, being outdoors where there’s almost infinitesimally low transmission, it seems absurd to have children wearing masks when they’re outdoors playing in sports and certainly in the elementary age group. I think to say we’re not going to let children go back to school unless they’re wearing masks is not following the science.” [Fox Business, 7/14/21] (VIDEO) 00:01:50

Miller-Meeks Suggested That Public Health Officials Should Recommend COVID-19 Testing Rather Than Boosters For Children And Those With Previous Infection And That Those Boosters Should Be Sent Overseas. MILLER-MEEKS: “We had five public health experts just recently in this hearing, asked them about infection-acquired immunity, asked them about the Israeli study, and all of them were less than supportive of evidence-based data that has come out about infection-acquired immunity. I put forward a bill to mandate all insurance, both private and federal, cover for serology testing for humoral antibodies and also T-cell antibodies, because we know the T-cell immunity is stronger and lasts longer. But yet, as you’re indicating, when we’re talking about trying to globally vaccinate countries, we’re vaccinating now children 16 to 17, and recommending boosters for individuals who may already have immunity rather than recommending testing for that. We don’t know in children, because the CDC, and I’ve asked this of Doctor Walensky, for those children who have died of COVID-19, what were their risk factors, what were their vulnerabilities? That’s information that we should know before recommending that every child be vaccinated, from the ages of 5-12 or 5-11, and then recommend boosters. Because as I think you indicated, would you agree those boosters could be doses that could go overseas to other countries in order to increase the rates of immunization?” [YouTube, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 12/14/21] (VIDEO) 00:04:52

Miller-Meeks: Infection-Acquired Immunity Was “As Beneficial As Vaccination, And In Some Cases More Beneficial.” MILLER-MEEKS: “And it seems to me that when we do not recognize infection-acquired immunity, which does provide immunity—the studies that have come out of Israel and other studies have shown that it is as beneficial as vaccination, and in some cases more beneficial because it’s not only to the spike protein—that we’re not addressing that and we could have the same accommodations for individuals in the workplace as we’ve had throughout the pandemic knowing that most infections occur at home or elsewhere outside the workplace.” [YouTube, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 10/25/21] (VIDEO) 00:04:13

Miller-Meeks Said Previous Infection With COVID-19 Should Be Sufficient To Bypass An Employer Vaccine Mandate. MILLER-MEEKS: “Well, I don't think that we should have a federal mandate for the COVID-19 vaccines. But interestingly enough, working in the hospitals in which I was a staff member, hospitals required us
to get vaccinated for influenza. Now, you could appeal that decision or you could ask for a waiver if you had a medical reason that you could not be vaccinated, if you had an allergy, or if you had previous, and I think in this case, if you can show that you've had previous infection with COVID-19, you ought to be able to use that for an employer. So, I think no vaccine mandate by the federal government, but I certainly understand businesses wanting to protect all of their employees and their customers, and so they may ask for an individual to provide a waiver and/or waiver liability.” [Fox Business, 6/14/21] (VIDEO) 00:02:50

**Miller-Meeks Claimed That The CDC's Morbidity And Mortality Weekly Report Showed That “Infection-Acquired Immunity Is As Equally Effective As Vaccine Immunity.”** MILLER-MEEKS: “However, this week, in the Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report from the CDC, we find that infection-acquired immunity is as equally effective as vaccine immunity. So, we should be talking about immunity and getting people immune.” [YouTube, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 11/5/21] (VIDEO) 00:00:45

**December 2021: Miller-Meeks Alleged That There Had Been More “Excess Deaths” Resulting From COVID-19 Lockdowns And Isolations Than Excess Deaths From Cases Of COVID-19.** MILLER-MEEKS: “I think that one of the costs of the pandemic and how we’ve responded to the pandemic -- I’ve addressed with Dr. Walensky and Dr Fauci and the subcommittee and the coronavirus task force -- is the number of excess deaths. We now know the number of excess deaths from how we handled COVID-19 with lockdowns, isolation, and banning social gatherings, that that has led to excess deaths which are now in excess of what has happened from COVID19 - - if in fact all deaths were COVID-19 and not somebody hospitalized with COVID-19.” [YouTube, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks M.D., 12/2/21] (VIDEO) 00:02:47

**Miller-Meeks Compared 277 COVID-19 Deaths In Children To Child Death Tolls From Influenza, H1N1, And Drowning.** ‘COVID-19 deaths in children were 277 through the end of April. To put this in perspective, the CDC estimates around 600 children died of influenza in 2017-2018 season, 358 died during the 2009 H1N1 pandemic and each year, more than 700 children die from drowning. We can see the light at the end of this pandemic tunnel, and as the number of Americans who are vaccinated continues to grow, coupled with those who have natural immunity from having the disease, I expect to see a return to normalcy and return to a pre-pandemic life.’ [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 5/12/21] (VIDEO)

**Miller-Meeks Criticized The American Rescue Plan (ARP), Claiming “Less Than One Half Of 1% Of The Total $1.9 Trillion Funding Went To Public Health Workforce.”** “ MILLER-MEEKS: “And in fact, I spoke on the floor of Congress in criticism of the latest COVID relief bill that passed because less than one half of 1% of the total $1.9 trillion funding went to public health workforce, and it could have gone to public health workforce and non-competitive grants to local public health workforce, of which in Iowa there are 101 local public health workforces, county departments who did amazing work during the pandemic.” [YouTube, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 9/30/21] (VIDEO) 00:00:15

**Miller-Meeks Said The Eviction Moratorium Hurts Small Businesses, Local Community Banks, And Renters Who “Can’t Pay Their Property Taxes Because They’ve Got No Income.”** “So remember that it was the moderate Democrats who kept the progressives from being able to have an extension of the eviction moratorium. Maxine Waters and other progressive Democrats were really pushing for that issue but as we know that’s an issue that hurts mom-and-pops, it hurts our local community banks, it hurts our tax base, when the person who as a landowner, property owner, who rents out just a simple property can’t pay their property taxes because they’ve got no income.” [FOX Business, 8/21/21] (VIDEO) 00:00:42-00:01:12

**April 2020: Miller-Meeks Said She Supported The Paycheck Protection Plan And Wanted To Expand The Program For Small Businesses.** At a Johnson County GOP Candidate Forum Miller-Meeks was said “So I think the payroll protection plan or the PPP needs to be expanded so that smaller businesses have more access to that funding. It’s a forgivable loan if it’s used to pay for rent or for employees in order to maintain them as employees to maintain their staff. [Johnson County GOP Candidate Forum, 00:07:34, 4/24/20] (VIDEO)

**Miller-Meeks: Vaccine Mandates For Health Care Workers Were “Hypocritical” Because They Had Been**
“Fighting This Virus For 18 Months And Have The Wherewithal And Knowledge To Understand And Make An Informed Decision.” MILLER-MEEKS: ‘How we have responded to reopening our economy and getting back to normal is also troublesome to me and presents a challenge for the healthcare sector specifically. Dr. McKinney, Dr. Roberts, and Dr. Kanter, all three of you mentioned in your written testimony issues with turnover and the struggle to recruit and retain health care workers. Meanwhile, we see an administration pushing for vaccine mandates among these very populations. These are the brave men and women who worked tirelessly, over a year through the pandemic with no vaccine to care for our country. This seems a little bit hypocritical to me that these health care professionals receive a vaccine after fighting this virus for 18 months and have the wherewithal and knowledge to understand and make an informed decision.’ [YouTube, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 9/29/21] (VIDEO) 00:02:04

Miller-Meeks Said People Should Be Able To Make Decisions On COVID-19 Vaccination Based On “The Appropriate Information” Rather Than FDA Or CDC Guidance. MILLER-MEEKS: “But we need appropriate information, we need appropriate messaging and we need to allow people to make decisions based on the appropriate information. We can protect one another, but we can also have the freedom to make decisions based on the information that we have rather than the guidance we’ve got from CDC, the FDA which has been you know variable information and I think you’re right. [Fox Business, 8/21/21] (VIDEO) 00:05:27

Miller-Meeks Said She Objected To Vaccine mandates Because The Vaccine “Is An Injectable Substance.” ‘I'm not for vaccine mandates. And the reason is that this is an injectable substance. It's a medicine that we are putting into people's bodies. I think if you can be honest and forthright with people let them know to check with their doctor if they have concerns. Try to get information, you know, clear guidance and information from the CDC would be tremendously helpful. And that includes adverse reactions and includes risks, which we still don't have a good risk-benefit analysis from the CDC regarding the vaccines, but overall highly effective, very safe, decades of research went into the making of these vaccines even if the vaccine came to the public very rapidly.’ [Miller-Meeks, CNN Newsroom With Pamela Brown, 7/25/21] (VIDEO) 00:03:50

Miller-Meeks Said She Did Not Think The Government In A Pandemic “Should Force You To Have A Vaccine.” ‘We certainly do need to have more testing and more sirological testing and I would love to get sirological testing. I don’t think the government in a pandemic such as this I do not think the government should force you to have a vaccine. Now there are other things the government may do, but I do not think they should force you to be tested nor should they force you to be treated. Although right now there’s really not much in the way of treatment excepting treating if you have a fever unless you develop such severe respiratory complications that you have to be hospitalized. So there’s not much in the way of treatment at this point in time.’ [Lee County GOP Candidate Forum, 00:52:04, 5/12/20] (VIDEO)

Miller-Meeks Said There Was A “Risk Of Myocarditis With The Vaccine” And ‘We Need Better Information From The CDC.” MILLER-MEEKS: ‘People are concerned, young people are concerned, because of the risk of myocarditis with the vaccine. Yes, there’s a risk from COVID-19, but there’s also a risk from the vaccine, and we need better information from the CDC.’ [Fox Business, 8/21/21] (VIDEO) 00:05:48

Miller-Meeks: “If You're Vaccinated, What Do You Have To Fear From Somebody Else Who Is Asymptomatic And Unvaccinated?” MILLER-MEEKS: ‘But now we're saying you can no longer protect yourself and others that way. If you're vaccinated, what do you have to fear from somebody else who is asymptomatic and unvaccinated? If you're vaccinated, what do you have to fear from somebody else who is asymptomatic and unvaccinated? If you're vaccinated, you are protected. If we're not vaccinated, we're at a danger? You're not at a danger to anyone.’ [YouTube, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 11/5/21] (VIDEO) 00:02:47

Miller-Meeks Said Unvaccinated Individuals Were “Not At A Danger To Anyone.” MILLER-MEEKS: ‘But now we're saying you can no longer protect yourself and others that way. If you're vaccinated, what do you have to fear from somebody else who is asymptomatic and unvaccinated? If you're vaccinated, you are protected. If we're not vaccinated, we're at a danger? You're not at a danger to anyone.’ [YouTube, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 11/5/21] (VIDEO) 00:02:47
Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-01) Research Book | Miller-Meeks Said COVID-19 Helped Control The Costs Of Education By Having All Classes Online. At a Johnson County GOP Candidate Forum Miller-Meeks, when asked for ways to control cost of higher education, said “Well I think one of the things that can control the cost of higher education is what we just seen happen through COVID-19 in the pandemic. And that is classes were cancelled for many people and they were done online. So having online education, having more support of our community colleges which help with both trades and apprenticeships, a skillset before going to a four-year institution will help to reduce the cost of a college education.” [Johnson County GOP Candidate Forum, 00:09:30, 4/24/20] (VIDEO)

Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-01) Research Book | Miller-Meeks Said Some Schools Were “Going To Go Back To Hybrid Learning Because Of The Omicron Variant, Which To This Point Has Had Very Little Fatalities.” MILLER-MEEKS: “And we just had another publication about that this week. Failing grades are rising, and child suicide rates are surging, and yet some schools remain remote or hybrid, despite no scientific basis for this decision. And we heard again this week that schools in certain states are going to go back to hybrid learning because of the Omicron variant, which to this point has had very little fatalities.” [YouTube, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 12/14/21] (VIDEO) 00:01:44

Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-01) Research Book | Miller-Meeks: “Teachers Were Prioritized For Vaccines” But “They Refused To Return To In-Person Instruction.” MILLER-MEEKS: “And one of the greatest problems today that we see, and I see, I've been told for over a year to listen to the science, and I listen to the science. But I see that there's a lack of evidence-based decision making from the Biden administration. And one example of this is what's happening in schools. President Biden promised to support a return to safe learning as quickly as possible. Yet, even as the teachers were prioritized for vaccines, they refused to return to in-person instruction. Students' learning loss due to remote or hybrid learning is astronomical.” [YouTube, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 12/14/21] (VIDEO) 00:01:12

Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-01) Research Book | Select Committee Republicans Tweeted That Miller-Meeks “Blasted The Biden Administration And The @CDCgov For Allowing The American Federation Of Teachers To Meddle In And Draft Scientific Guidance Regarding Reopening Schools.” “Today, @RepMMM blasted the Biden Administration and the @CDCgov for allowing the American Federation of Teachers to meddle in and draft scientific guidance regarding reopening schools. America's classrooms should be governed by medical science.” [Twitter, @SelectGOP, 5/19/21] (VIDEO)

Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-01) Research Book | Miller-Meeks: “To Say We’re Not Going To Let Children Go Back To School Unless They’re Wearing Masks Is Not Following The Science.” “We have known for over a year that children don’t transmit the virus. So delaying children going to summer camps, being outdoors where there’s almost infinitesimally low transmission, it seems absurd to have children wearing masks when they’re outdoors playing in sports and certainly in the elementary age group. I think to say we’re not going to let children go back to school unless they’re wearing masks is not following the science.” [Fox Business, 7/14/21] (VIDEO) 00:01:50

Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-01) Research Book | Miller-Meeks Said The Eviction Moratorium Hurts Small Businesses, Local Community Banks, And Landlords Who “Can’t Pay Their Property Taxes Because They’ve Got No Income.” “So remember that it was the moderate Democrats who kept the progressives from being able to have an extension of the eviction moratorium. Maxine Waters and other progressive Democrats were really pushing for that issue but as we know that’s an issue that hurts mom-and-pops, it hurts our local community banks, it hurts our tax base, when the person who as a landowner, property owner, who rents out just a simple property can’t pay their property taxes because they’ve got no income.” [FOX Business, 8/21/21] (VIDEO) 00:00:42-00:01:12

Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-01) Research Book | May 2020: Miller-Meeks Praised Trump And Governor Reynolds For The Way They Handled The Pandemic. At a Lee County GOP Candidate Forum, Miller-Meeks stated “So I think both President Trump and Governor Reynolds handled this situation, the pandemic, the way they should have handled it, especially watching what was coming out of New York. […] So Governor Reynolds, I think had the appropriate actions. There are governors that certainly had an authoritarian crackdown and went way too far. I think people are willing to comply, they’re willing to shelter at home, go out when necessary as we started the pandemic, as long as it seems reasonable and pragmatic given what we know about the virus.” [Lee County GOP Candidate Forum, 00:51:00, 5/12/20]
Miller-Meeks Thought The Way Trump Had Responded To The Pandemic Was A Good Example Of Federalism. At a Muscatine County GOP Forum, Miller-Meeks was asked “What is the proper role of the federal government?” Miller-Meeks responded “And I think you’ve seen an example of federalism in how President Trump has responded to the pandemic and the Coronavirus and we’ve also seen the excesses of some of the governors who have really been much more authoritarian and dictatorial of they’ve responded to the pandemic within their state. So it’s a great example of federalism in response to the pandemic.” [Muscatine County GOP Forum, 00:24:48, 5/26/20]

May 2020: Miller-Meeks Said She Thought It Was “Appropriate To Begin Opening Up.” At a Lee County GOP Candidate Forum, Miller-Meeks stated “I think it’s appropriate to begin opening up and we need to trust the sense and sensibilities of the American people and of Iowans to determine how much risk they’re willing to take. If you’re elderly, if you have medical conditions, then perhaps you want to stay at home. But I think we’re at the point now where we need to begin to allow our economy to open up, we need to allow businesses to start to reopen, to be frequented, and part of that is developing the trust of the customer and how much.” [Lee County GOP Candidate Forum, 00:51:34, 5/12/20]

Education Issues

Miller-Meeks Said She Would Cut The Department Of Education, Saying “The Role Of Education Should Be Through The State. So The Department Of Education At The Federal Level Plays An Oversized Role In Education.” At a Muscatine County GOP Forum, Miller-Meeks was asked “What agencies can we cut from the government to rein in spending and provide better oversight? Or how would you gain better oversight into our many government agencies for better public transparency?” Miller-Meeks responded “Well, certainly, Department of Education, the role of education should be through the state. So the Department of Education at the federal level plays an oversized role in education. And so looking at reducing and by attrition, ie when someone retires or don’t hire somebody to fill that position are ways that you can start reducing. […] And so looking at how our funding is what the sources sunsetting of laws and then not having automatic 2% increases in the budget year after year, but looking at the budget, just because you don’t if you don’t raise the funding to an agency doesn’t mean you’re cutting, cutting their budget. or cutting spending. So I don’t agree with automatic raises any of the agencies. [Muscatine County GOP Forum, 00:42:06, 5/26/20]

Energy & Environment Issues

Miller-Meeks: Natural Gas Was “Clean And Carbon-Friendly” But Biden “Shut Down The Keystone Pipeline Immediately.” NIEDLEMAN: “And when the statistic I gave you just a moment ago was the United States ranks 10th in the industrial countries essentially. You mentioned Iowa's leading the way, but shouldn't the United States be a world leader in this area?” MILLER-MEEKS: “Well, I think the United States was a world leader. We were also a world leader in energy production. Think how clean and carbon-friendly natural gas is, but yet, President Biden shut down the Keystone Pipeline immediately, and lifted sanctions from Russia for the Nord Stream 2 Pipeline to go forward.” [YouTube, Local 4 News WHBF, 6/20/21 (VIDEO)]

Miller-Meeks: Having “More Money Going Into Electric Vehicle Car Charging Stations Than You Have Roads And Bridges” Was “Misplaced When You're Developing A Policy Package For Infrastructure.”
NIEDLEMAN: “So, where do you stand on building a green energy infrastructure?” […] MILLER-MEEKS: “So, I think that we can move forward on green energy. But when you have more money going into electric vehicle car charging stations than you have roads and bridges, it seems to me that that, you know, that's a little bit misplaced when you're developing a policy package for infrastructure. So, that would be one of the things I would look at.” [YouTube, Local 4 News WHBF, 6/20/21] (VIDEO)

Ethics & Government Accountability
Miller-Meeks: “It Seems To Me That Republicans Do A Better Job Of Holding Their Members Of Congress Accountable Than Democrats.” At a Muscatine County GOP Forum, Miller-Meeks was asked “What measures would you propose to strengthen ethics rules and help restore the public’s confidence in their government? “Miller-Meeks responded “And the other thing, it seems to me that Republicans do a better job of holding their members of Congress accountable than Democrats. We’ve seen that in, you know, members within our own state losing committee memberships, investigations that take place now rightly so. Looking at members of Congress that may have unethical conduct or behavior, we’ve seen politicians from nearby states who have, you know, lost committees lost memberships, or were not supported in their bids for re election. And I think those instances where I find that the Republican Party seems to hold their members more accountable than the Democrat Party, certainly having a media that holds everyone accountable, no matter what party you’re.” [Muscatine County GOP Forum, 5/26/20] (VIDEO) 01:16:23

Miller-Meeks: “One Way To Hold Government Accountable Is At Election Time To Throw People Out Of Office If You Don’t Think They’re Doing Their Job.” According to Miller-Meeks for Congress 2020 website, Miller-Meeks stated “One of the things I get asked about on the campaign trail all the time is what is government doing and who holds government accountable. And we’ve certainly seen that recently in the impeachment inquiry that’s going on in Congress government is they’re elected to serve people and they need to be accountable to the people they serve. One way to hold government accountable is at election time to throw people out of office if you don’t think they’re doing their job. But more importantly, we need to be using the reports from the inspector general’s the Attorney General’s and we need to hold government accountable for the things that it does.” [Miller-Meeks for Congress 2020, Government Accountability, 00:00:00, accessed 6/22/20] (VIDEO)

Health Care

2019: Miller-Meeks Claimed The ACA Had Caused Increased Premiums And Drug Prices Through Triggering Consolidation Of Medical Practices And Hospitals. “Also with the Affordable Care Act we saw premiums increase dramatically, we saw drug prices go up dramatically, we’ve seen consolidation of hospitals to larger hospital systems, and we’ve also seen consolidation of small independent physician practices into larger practices or consumed by hospital or health care systems. All of this has led to increased costs, so absolutely what happens at the federal government level affects me every single day and how I can deliver the best care, the highest quality care, the most accessible care possible to my patients.” [YouTube, Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 11/14/19] (VIDEO) 00:02:55

Miller-Meeks Said The Use Of Electronic Medical Records Mandated By The ACA Was “Very Cumbersome And Takes A Lot Of Time” And Robbed Patients Of Face Time With Providers. “We’re now mandated to do electronic health records after the Affordable Care Act went through. And the electronic health records, while they may allow transmission of information, we don’t necessarily always have the data that we need, and it’s very cumbersome and takes a lot of time. It’s led to a lot of frustration in the provider community, whether you’re a doctor, a nurse practitioner or physician’s assistant, whether you’re an emergency room provider, it’s led to so much frustration within the healthcare community that we’re spending more and more time on an electronic record with our back towards our patient and less and less face to face time.” [YouTube, Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 11/14/19] (VIDEO) 00:02:17

Miller-Meeks Said People Aren’t Buying Insurance Because It Was Too Expensive After The Affordable Care Act. In an interview with 4TR Studios on health care, Miller-Meeks was asked “wasn’t there a sharing of the burden of insurance with some high-risk patients paying less than low-risk ones?” Miller-Meeks said “if you look at New York, where they did community rating their costs went way up when the ACA went through. So now people aren’t buying insurance because it’s too expensive. People were supposed to have a reduction in their premiums by 25% and that didn’t happen. So how do we get access while also making it affordable and how do we have choice.” [4TR Studios Health Care Interview, 00:01:45, 4/23/20] (VIDEO)

Miller-Meeks: “To Me, The Best Thing The ACA Did Was Get More People On Insurance And More Accessibility. What We Lost Was Affordability.” In an interview with 4TR Studios on health care, Miller-Meeks
was asked “Would you work within the framework of ACA or go with the party line of repealing all together?” Miller-Meeks said “you work with the framework you have and look at the system and other systems that work. Countries that have systems that do have a mix of private and public insurance. To me, the best thing the ACA did was get more people on insurance and more accessibility. What we lost was affordability.” [4TR Studios Healthcare Interview, 00:02:45 4/23/20] (VIDEO)

Miller-Meeks Said She Was In Favor Of Health Insurance Coverage Choice Adding “In The ACA, Some Of The Essential Benefits Are Much More Than What People Had Before So That Led To Increased Cost.” In an interview with 4TR Studios on health care, Miller-Meeks was asked “Don’t insurance companies limit choices by determining what they will and won’t cover?” Miller-Meeks said “yes but you have an option in your plan to determine what you want so there is some benefit in that. I thinks if you understand the insurance industry whether it’s auto or health insurance, we don’t mandate companies cover everything to maintain your car. So they don’t cover oil changes or new tires. If we mandated them cover those things you would see the cost of your insurance go up. When you’re increasing the number of providers and increasing the benefits. You have a benefits plan instead of an insurance plan. In the ACA, some of the essential benefits are much more than what people had before so that led to increased cost. So you should have a choice in determining how much coverage you need based on your age, sex, what your health status is and that is reflected in your premiums.” [4TR Studios Health Care Interview, 00:04:20 4/23/20] (VIDEO)

2021: Miller-Meeks Compared Medicare Negotiating Drug Prices To The Afghanistan Withdrawal And That “If You Think That It Went Just Swimmingly, Then Of Course You Want President Biden And His Team To Negotiate Prices For You On Drugs.” MILLER-MEEKS: “If I may, an example of that is, look at the Afghanistan withdrawal. And so, if you think that it went just swimmingly, then of course you want President Biden and his team to negotiate prices for you on drugs. If you don't think it went very well, then maybe we need to rethink how much of the government we want controlling that.” [YouTube, Kevin McCarthy, 11/5/21] (VIDEO) 00:29:15

2021: Miller-Meeks Said Allowing The Government To Control Drug Prices Would Lead To “Rationing Of Care” Based On “How Valuable Your Life Is.” MILLER-MEEKS: “And that is that in countries where there is government control of pricing, and there is that disparity, they also utilize your access to drugs or medications or surgery through a lens of quality-adjusted life years. And so, what this does—and think about this, if you have a child who's born with a rare disease, or a debilitating disease, or you're an individual that develops a cancer and you're at 70 years old, rather than 30 years old, the government that is going to determine your access to care by what they value your life. And so, if you're a senior citizen, the value of your life is less than if you were a young adult, and in the United States, are we ready to have—in essence, this is rationing of care. It's not, you know, it is not a scare tactic. This is precisely what will be done on the basis of how valuable your life is. And constitutionally, we know that we don't have any second-class citizens. But this sets us up to divide Americans apart into whose life is more valuable, so who gets access to treatment and who gets access to drugs, and I think it is such a discriminatory practice.” [YouTube, Kevin McCarthy, 11/5/21] (VIDEO) 00:37:46

Miller-Meeks: “We Know That Price Is An Issue That Helps People Not Overutilize Health Care.” “So health care for all, the solution is to allow the marketplace to help with health care. We know that price is an issue that helps people not overutilize health care. And then there’s health, and medical care. There’s two issues at stake and looking at where healthcare is going in the future, if we don’t handle health care costs now, fraud and abuse in our healthcare systems, having a Medicare for all system will end up being no medical care for anyone.” [YouTube, Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 11/14/19] (VIDEO) 00:01:27

Miller-Meeks Blamed The Rise Of Health Care Costs On Medicare Overuse. “Two words, competition and insurance. If you look at the cost of health care in the United States, the rapid rise began in 1970. And the rise in health care costs exceeded inflation. This is because Medicare was instituted in 1965. As seniors became more adept at utilizing the Medicare system to pay for care that they previously had not accessed, the cost escalated. We also know from numerous health care studies […] show that when someone doesn't bear the cost of health care,
they utilize more. So overutilization began to be the norm.” [Mariannette Miller Meeks Conversation on Health Care, 00:00:28, 9/4/09] (VIDEO)

**Infrastructure**

Miller-Meeks Said Democrats Should “Pass An Infrastructure Bill” Because “They Would Have Bipartisan Support For That.” HOST: “If it’s such a great plan, why do they need to beg their own party to get on board?” MILLER-MEEKS: “They don’t need to beg their own party. Pass an infrastructure bill. They would have bipartisan support for that. Forget the other bill because they’re having difficulty even among their own party to get it through.” [YouTube, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 10/27/21] (VIDEO) 00:03:39

Miller-Meeks Said She Could Support An Infrastructure Package That Was Focused On “Traditional Infrastructure” And “Doesn’t Raise Taxes.” NIEDLEMAN: “Now, there’s a lot of focus on this bipartisan group of 10 senators to come up with an infrastructure deal. How confident are you that they’ll come up with something that you can support?” MILLER-MEEKS: “Well, I think if you have a bill that is focused on infrastructure, such as roads, bridges, locks and dams, waterways, airports, broadband, and then the electric grid infrastructure, which sometimes gets lost in this infrastructure bill, and doesn’t raise taxes, then I think it’s something that I could support. So, traditional infrastructure. The original bill that was floated had 115 billion for roads and bridges out of $2.3 trillion, and I think most people would say that’s a bill that’s very short-sighted. So, I think, you know, if it focuses on infrastructure, which we all agree with, then I do have confidence that something can come about that would be bipartisan, and I could vote for it.” [YouTube, Local 4 News WHBF, 6/20/21] (VIDEO)

Miller-Meeks: An Infrastructure Framework Around $1 Trillion Was “Workable” But If Further Spending Plans Included Tax Increases, “Negotiations Could Falter Once Again.” MILLER-MEEKS: “So, you know, a framework in the trillion-dollar range that’s been compromised between both the Democrats and the Republican senators is something that’s workable. You know, there’s bipartisan support for an infrastructure bill. There’s just not bipartisan support for a Democrat wish list which is what they’re trying to push forward, which would include tax increases. So, I think the you know, the devil is in the details, as usual. And so, if they have a compromise of 1 trillion, but they’re still floating this 6 trillion out there, where there would be tax increases, I think that it’s possible that negotiations could falter once again.” [YouTube, Fox News, 6/19/21] 00:02:44 (VIDEO)

**Seniors’ Issues**

Miller-Meeks Compared Medicare Negotiating Drug Prices To The Afghanistan Withdrawal And That “If You Think That It Went Just Swimmingly, Then Of Course You Want President Biden And His Team To Negotiate Prices For You On Drugs.” MILLER-MEEKS: “If I may, an example of that is, look at the Afghanistan withdrawal. And so, if you think that it went just swimmingly, then of course you want President Biden and his team to negotiate prices for you on drugs. If you don’t think it went very well, then maybe we need to rethink how much of the government we want controlling that.” [YouTube, Kevin McCarthy, 11/5/21] (VIDEO) 00:29:15

December 2021: Miller-Meeks Said She Was “Still Working” On “Lowering Prescription Drug Prices.” “MILLER-MEEKS: We’re still working on prescription, lowering prescription drug prices. So I think, given the things that I’ve done, I expect to be reelected and by a much larger margin that six votes.” [YouTube, Iowa Press, 12/17/21] (VIDEO) 00:06:19

Miller-Meeks Said Allowing The Government To Control Drug Prices Would Lead To “Rationing Of Care” And Access To Prescription Drugs Based On “How Valuable Your Life Is.” MILLER-MEEKS: “And that is that in countries where there is government control of pricing, and there is that disparity, they also utilize your access to drugs or medications or surgery through a lens of quality-adjusted life years. And so, what this does—and think about this, if you have a child who's born with a rare disease, or a debilitating disease, or you're an individual that develops a cancer and you're at 70 years old, rather than 30 years old, the government that is going to
determine your access to care by what they value your life. And so, if you're a senior citizen, the value of your life is less than if you were a young adult, and in the United States, are we ready to have—in essence, this is rationing of care. It's not, you know, it is not a scare tactic. This is precisely what will be done on the basis of how valuable your life is. And constitutionally, we know that we don't have any second-class citizens. But this sets us up to divide Americans apart into whose life is more valuable, so who gets access to treatment and who gets access to drugs, and I think it is such a discriminatory practice.” [YouTube, Kevin McCarthy, 11/5/21] (VIDEO) 00:37:46

Miller-Meeks Blamed The Rise Of Health Care Costs On Medicare Overuse. “Two words, competition and insurance. If you look at the cost of health care in the United States, the rapid rise began in 1970. And the rise in health care costs exceeded inflation. This is because Medicare was instituted in 1965. As seniors became more adept at utilizing the Medicare system to pay for care that they previously had not accessed, the cost escalated. We also know from numerous health care studies [...] show that when someone doesn't bear the cost of health care, they utilize more. So overutilization began to be the norm.” [Mariannette Miller Meeks Conversation on Health Care, 00:00:28, 9/4/09] (VIDEO)

### Taxes

**June 2021: Miller-Meeks Said She Did Not Want To Raise Taxes On Corporations Because “Taxes On Investment Hurts All Of Us.”** NIEDLEMAN: “You just mentioned how Republicans are drawing that line in the sand that an infrastructure deal can't raise taxes, specifically on corporations, and that would force the president's two trillion dollar-plus proposal to be cut, essentially, in about half. But yet, the Institute on Taxation and Economic Policy found 55 of the largest corporations paid no taxes for their most recent fiscal year, and they put a price on that tax avoidance at $12 billion. So, why aren't Republicans trying to force corporations to pay income taxes and perhaps pay for that infrastructure? Are you okay with that?” MILLER-MEEKS: “Well, I think you can certainly look at the tax code and the tax structure to determine you know, how you pay taxes, what gets paid in taxes, and then we have to be very mindful that taxes on investment hurts all of us because that money gets invested into companies, to businesses, to venture capital, to entrepreneurs, which helps create jobs and grow our economy. So, you know, we know that there are taxes that are harmful and don't help grow an economy, that don't create jobs. And then we know that there is a taxation level at which most of us agree is fair.” [YouTube, Local 4 News WHBF, 6/20/21] (VIDEO)

### Audio

**COVID-19**

Miller-Meeks: “Don’t Force Mask Mandates On Everyone Who Is Vaccinated. That Makes Absolutely No Sense.” “Dr. Miller-Meeks had this to say, ‘I am very concerned about what the CDC is doing now. I think that this guidance, number one, the guidance was slow to begin with as far as removing masks, if you were fully vaccinated, I firmly believe that the vaccines work, that they’re effective, I believe the science behind the vaccine. And so if your double vaccinated, leave that to individuals to determine, given their personal health history and their personal medical risk, to wear a mask if they’re concerned or anxious about catching the Delta variant or the lambda variant that is coming up from South America. But don’t force mask mandates on everyone who is vaccinated. That makes absolutely no sense. And I’ve yet to see that data. So if I have the opportunity and I think I will speak with members of the Doc caucus to send a letter to Dr. Wollensky at the CDC asking for the research and the studies that in fact support going and recommending masks on people that are double vaccinated.’” [Fox News Radio, 7/28/21] (AUDIO)

Miller-Meeks: “Don’t Force Mask Mandates On Everyone Who Is Vaccinated. That Makes Absolutely No Sense.” “Dr. Miller-Meeks had this to say, ‘I am very concerned about what the CDC is doing now. I think that this guidance, number one, the guidance was slow to begin with as far as removing masks, if you were fully vaccinated, I firmly believe that the vaccines work, that they’re effective, I believe the science behind the vaccine. And so if your double vaccinated, leave that to individuals to determine, given their personal health history and their personal
medical risk, to wear a mask if they’re concerned or anxious about catching the Delta variant or the lambda variant that is coming up from South America. But don’t force mask mandates on everyone who is vaccinated. That makes absolutely no sense. And I’ve yet to see that data. So if I have the opportunity and I think I will speak with members of the Doc caucus to send a letter to Dr. Wollensky at the CDC asking for the research and the studies that in fact support going and recommending masks on people that are double vaccinated.” [Fox News Radio, 7/28/21] (AUDIO)

---

### Energy & Environment Issues

**Miller-Meeks Praised The “Succinct, Concrete Metrics” Of The Navigable Waters Protection Rule In Contrast To WOTUS, Which She Said “Leaves Too Much Interpretation Up To Whoever Is In Authority.”**

‘I’m just grateful to my colleagues for being here. It elevates this issue and it’s something that affects every American. It doesn’t matter if you’re a road builder, if you’re a sand and gravel quarry, if you’re a home builder, it affects all of this in all aspects of our life. Whether you’re in a rental or you’re wanting to buy a home, the largest or the smallest, multi-family housing, the Navigable Waters Protection Rule put in succinct, concrete metrics for what was considered a navigable waterway and going back to WOTUS really hampers us because it leaves too much interpretation up to whoever is in authority to implement those rules and regulations. And that regulation, back to the WOTUS regulation, is vague to begin with. That leaves a lot of uncertainty. So will someone take the risk to try to build housing that the average person can afford and move into? And how does that impact our rural communities?’ [KNIA-KRLS Radio, 8/19/21] (AUDIO) 00:07:10-00:08:07

### Foreign Policy

**Miller-Meeks: The Withdrawal From Afghanistan “Would’ve Been Absolutely Different” Under Trump Because The Taliban “Feared And Respected President Trump.”**

LEONARD: “President Trump wanted us out May 1st. Do you know if President Trump had any better plans for dealing with a situation like this or would we have been in the same position or worse on May 1st, which was President Trump’s deadline?” MILLER-MEEKS: “I think it would’ve been absolutely different. Number one, President Trump is a different president. President Trump did not put us back in to the Iran nuclear agreement, which President Biden did, which further emboldened Iran and terrorists and jihadists in the Middle East. President Trump took out Soleimani. So, the terrorists, the jihadists, the Taliban, knew that President Trump would act, and they feared and respected President Trump. And so, to compare the two, President Trump would have had a plan, and he had conditions, and conditions for withdrawal, and he would have made sure those conditions were met before he would withdraw troops. So, I think to say that because President Trump initiated an agreement to remove troops by May doesn’t mean the outcome would have been the same.” [KNIA-KRLS, 8/18/21] (AUDIO) 00:07:52

**Miller-Meeks Said Trump Would Not Have Abandoned The Afghans Like He Abandoned The Kurds Because He “Learned From Previous Actions.”**

LEONARD: “And you expressed regrets he abandoned the Kurds. How do you know that he wouldn’t have abandoned the Afghan people?” MILLER-MEEKS: “I think because President Trump learned from previous actions, and I think the actions that he took on Soleimani, I think, demonstrated that he had learned more about the Middle East, how to interact with the Middle East, what things they respect, and how to conduct operations.” [KNIA-KRLS, 8/18/21] (AUDIO) 00:10:12

### LGBTQ+ Issues

**Miller-Meeks: “It’s Also Concerning To Me When I See Biological Males Competing In Female Sports, […] Have We Gone Too Far In, In Support Of People Making Different Choices, When It Really Is Disadvantaging An Entire Group Of People?”** According to an interview gave on Caffeinated Thoughts Podcast, when asked about gender identity to protected classes Miller-Meeks said “I certainly strongly believe that we need to protect religious liberty. It’s also concerning to me when I see as a woman when I see biological males competing in female sports, and winning in female sports, and allowed to compete. And so that brings up the question Have we gone too far in, in support of people making different choices, when it really is disadvantaging an
entire group of people? I was told you need to read bills and understand them. I hesitate to say I wouldn’t support it. In Iowa have a balanced budget amendment but we didn’t care about deficit spending in the federal government.” [Caffeinated Thoughts, 12/3/19] (AUDIO) 00:28:38

**Trump**

Miller-Meeks Wondered Whether Trump’s Impeachment Trial Was “Like Kavanaugh 2.0.” According to an interview gave on Caffeinated Thoughts Podcast, when asked for her “thoughts on what she’s heard from witnesses during the impeachment”, Miller-Meeks said, “The concerns that I have about the process is 1. That it has not been transparent, and you really wonder if this is like Kavanaugh 2.0. The intelligence committee changing what they think is a whistleblower, at the time a whistleblower came forward. This whole process of changing the rules of what’s considered a whistleblower, that was problematic. I see that the way the process has unfolded has not been transparent. It has not been a bipartisan process. You wonder if they are trying to overturn an a duly elected president.” [Caffeinated Thoughts, 00:07:10, 12/3/19] (AUDIO)

**Images**

September 2021: Miller-Meeks Shared A Story Claiming That Biden Ordered The VA To Withhold Health Benefits From Unvaccinated Veterans, Adding “If True, This Is Insane!”

If true, this is insane! Biden Orders VA To Withhold Health Benefits From Unvaccinated Veterans
delawareohionews.com/national-news/... via @DelawareOhNews

10:38 PM - Sep 12, 2021 - Twitter for iPhone
[Twitter, @millermeeeks, 9/12/21]

**Headlines**

HEADLINE: Quad-City Times: “Miller-Meeks: Trump Should Stay And 'Plenty Of Blame To Go Around' For US Capitol Riot.” [Quad-City Times, 1/7/21]

HEADLINE: “Iowa Congresswoman Tweets Misinformation About Biden, Unvaccinated Veterans.” [WOI, 9/13/21]

HEADLINE: Iowa Starting Line: “IA-02: Miller-Meeks Touted Unproven Malaria Drug For COVID Cases.” [Iowa Starting Line, 4/22/20]


HEADLINE: “Miller-Meeks Votes Against Infrastructure Bill With Earmarks For Iowa's 2nd District.” [Quad-City Times, 7/2/21]

HEADLINE: “Miller-Meeks Votes Against Local Projects She Requested Funds For.” [Iowa Starting Line, 7/6/21]

Personal & Professional History
Biography

This section provides background information on Miller-Meek’s personal life, including education, personal finances, criminal and civil record, and other areas. Searches were conducted with various local media in Wapello County, media outlets including the Des Moines Register, Quad City Times, Hawk Eye, as well as a number of other online resources, including Lexis-Nexis.

Birth Date

**Miller-Meeks Was Born Mariannette Jane Miller On September 6, 1955**

Miller-Meeks Was Born Mariannette Jane Miller On September 6, 1955. [VoteBuilder, 6/16/20]

2018: Miller-Meeks Said She Kept Her Maiden Name As A Reminder Of Her Childhood Growing Up Poor In A Family Of Eight In Texas

Miller-Meeks Said She Kept Her Maiden Name As A Reminder Of Her Childhood Growing Up Poor In A Family Of Eight In Texas. “Miller-Meeks said she kept her maiden name as reminder of her childhood growing up poor in a family of eight living in Texas.” [The Quad-City Times, 10/12/14]

**Miller-Meeks Was Born In Herlong, California**

Miller-Meeks Was Born In Herlong, California. “Mariannette Miller-Meeks […] Place of birth: Herlong, Calif.” [Citizen-Times, 10/8/14]

**Miller-Meeks Grew Up In LaCoste, Texas And Other US Locations**

Miller-Meeks Grew Up In LaCoste, Texas And Throughout The US. “Mariannette Miller-Meeks […] Grew up: LaCoste, Texas, and throughout the U.S. (military).” [Citizen-Times, 10/8/14]

**Miller-Meeks Left Home At Age 16 After Being Severely Burned In A Kitchen Fire**

Miller-Meeks Left Home At Age 16 After Being Severely Burned In A Kitchen Fire. “The 65-year-old ophthalmologist left home at age 16 after being severely burned in a kitchen fire, worked her way through college to earn her nursing degree, enlisted in the U.S. Army at age 18 where she served for 24 years, became a doctor, led the Iowa Department of Public Health under former Iowa Gov. Terry Branstad and served in the Iowa Senate.” [Quad-City Times, 1/3/21]

Education

**1993-1994: Miller-Meeks Completed A Fellowship At The University of Michigan Specializing In Glaucoma**

### 1988-1991: Miller-Meeks Was A Resident In The University Of Iowa Department Of Ophthalmology

According to Mariannette Miller-Meeks’ LinkedIn, Miller-Meeks was a resident in the University of Iowa Department of Ophthalmology from 1988 to 1991. [Mariannette Miller-Meeks LinkedIn, accessed 1/25/22]

### 1986-1987: Miller-Meeks Was An Intern In General Surgery At UT Health San Antonio

According to Mariannette Miller-Meeks’ LinkedIn, Miller-Meeks was an intern in general surgery at UT Health San Antonio from 1986 to 1987. [Mariannette Miller-Meeks LinkedIn, accessed 1/25/22]

### 1982-1986: Miller-Meeks Obtained An MD From UT Health San Antonio

According to Mariannette Miller-Meeks’ LinkedIn, Miller-Meeks obtained an MD from UT Health San Antonio from 1982 to 1986. [Mariannette Miller-Meeks LinkedIn, accessed 1/25/22]

### 1979-1980: Miller-Meeks Obtained A Master’s In Science And Education From University Of Southern California

According to Mariannette Miller-Meeks’ LinkedIn, Miller-Meeks obtained a Master’s in Science and Education from University of Southern California from 1979 to 1980. [Mariannette Miller-Meeks LinkedIn, accessed 1/25/22]

Miller-Meeks said she completed her Master’s degree while living abroad in Seoul, South Korea on Army Assignment. “She met her future husband while stationed at Walter Reed Army Hospital, and continued to work night shift while procuring the remainder of her pre-med courses. When reassigned to Seoul, Korea, there she completed a Master of Science degree in Education from University of Southern California because the colleges didn’t offer any pre-med courses. After 6 years active duty, she entered medical school in 1982 at the University of Texas and graduated in the top of her class, achieving Alpha Omega Alpha (the national medical honor society).” [Miller-Meeks for Congress 2010, archive accessed 6/15/20]

### 1974-1976: Miller-Meeks Received A BSN From Texas Christian University

According to Mariannette Miller-Meeks’ LinkedIn, Miller-Meeks graduated with a BSN in Nursing from Texas Christian University from 1974 to 1976. [Mariannette Miller-Meeks LinkedIn, accessed 1/25/22]

An Army Program Paid For The Last Two Years Of Tuition And Books Towards Miller-Meeks’ BSN

Miller-Meeks obtained her Nursing Degree by having two years of her tuition and books paid for by an Army Program. “Through an Army program that paid for the tuition and books for the last 2 years of a Bachelor of Science degree in Nursing, she left high school and home at 16 to enter San Antonio Junior College, working full time to support herself. Upon completing 2 years of required courses, she transferred to Texas Christian University and was awarded her bachelor’s degree graduating summa cum laude and inducted into Sigma Theta Tau the National Nursing Honor Society. She transferred from the enlisted ranks into the officer corps as a nurse at 20 years of age.” [Our Campaigns, 4/17/10]

Miller-Meeks Left High School At 16 To Enter San Antonio Junior College Through An Army Nursing Program. “Through an Army program that paid for the tuition and books for the last 2 years of a Bachelor of Science degree in Nursing, she left high school and home at 16 to enter San Antonio Junior College, working full time to support herself. Upon completing 2 years of required courses, she transferred to Texas Christian University and was awarded her bachelor’s degree graduating summa cum laude and inducted into Sigma Theta Tau the National Nursing Honor Society. She transferred from the enlisted ranks into the officer corps as a nurse at 20 years of age.” [Our Campaigns, 4/17/10]

Miller-Meeks Entered College With Some Financial Assistance Through A Military Program. “At 16, Miller-Meeks successfully completed high school through an accelerated studies program. Soon after, she entered college with some financial assistance through a military program.” [Fort Madison Daily Democrat, 10/31/14]

Career

The following provides a brief overview of Miller-Meeks’ professional career:

**Political**
- 2021-Present: Member, US House of Representatives, IA-02
- 2019-2021: Iowa State Senator, District 41
- 2014: Republican Candidate for US House of Representatives, IA-02
- 2011-2014: Director of Iowa Department of Public Health (Appointed by Governor Terry Branstad)
- 2010: Republican Candidate for US House of Representatives, IA-02
- 2008: Republican Candidate for US House of Representatives, IA-02

**Professional**
- 2015-Unknown: Great River Eye Specialists, Ophthalmologist
- 2011-2014: Director of Iowa Department of Public Health
- 1997-2008: Heartland Eye Care, Private Practice Ophthalmologist
- 1983-2000: United States Army Reserve, Medical Services

2015-Unknown: Miller-Meeks Was An Ophthalmologist At Great River Eye Specialists

2015-Present: Miller-Meeks Said She Was An Ophthalmologist At Great River Eye Specialists, According to Mariannette Miller-Meeks’ LinkedIn page, Miller-Meeks was an Ophthalmologist at Great River Eye Specialists from 2015 to Present. [Mariannette Miller-Meeks LinkedIn, accessed 1/25/22]

2022: Miller-Meeks Was No Longer Employed By Great River Health Eye Specialists
Miller-Meeks Was No Longer Employed By Great River Health Eye Specialists Of West Burlington, IA. [Phone Conversation with Great River Health Eye Specialists, 2/28/22]

2022: Miller-Meeks Had An Active Medical License, Specializing In Ophthalmology

Miller-Meeks Had An Active Medical License, Specializing In Ophthalmology. According to the Iowa Board of Medicine, Mariannette Miller-Meeks had an active medical license. Her primary specialty was listed as ophthalmology. [Iowa Board of Medicine, accessed 1/27/22]

[Physician - Permanent Details]

Iowa Board of Medicine, accessed 1/27/22

2011-2014: Miller-Meeks Served As Director Of The Iowa Department Of Public Health

January 2014: Miller-Meeks Resigned As Director Of The Iowa Department Of Public Health. “Iowa's top public-health official, who was criticized this week for unsubstantiated comments about food stamps, has resigned. Dr. Mariannette Miller-Meeks' resignation was announced this morning by Gov. Terry Branstad. ‘It is with regret that I accept Mariannette's resignation, as she was a director who served with great passion,’ the governor said in a press release. ‘Mariannette has been a champion of health in Iowa, including working to promote our Healthiest State Initiative. Lieutenant Governor Reynolds and I thank her for her service to the people of Iowa.’ The Ottumwa ophthalmologist had been director of the Iowa Department of Public Health since Branstad took office three years ago.” [Des Moines Register, 1/9/14]
Miller-Meeks Said She Served As Director Of Iowa Department Of Public Health From 2011-2013. According to Mariannette Miller-Meeks’ LinkedIn page, Miller-Meeks served as Director of Iowa Department of Public Health from 2011 to 2013. [Mariannette Miller-Meeks LinkedIn, accessed 1/25/22]

December 2010: Iowa Governor-Elect Terry Branstad Appointed Miller-Meeks As The Head Of The Iowa Department Of Public Health. “Iowa Gov.-elect Terry Branstad appointed former Congressional candidate Mariannette Miller-Meeks as the head of the Iowa Department of Public Health Thursday. Miller-Meeks, the first female faculty member in the University of Iowa ophthalmology department, will head the agency that works with local health organizations, lawmakers, and health-care providers to educate Iowa citizens on health. ‘I am honored to have been chosen by Gov. Branstad and Lt.-Gov.-elect Reynolds to head the Iowa Department of Public Health,” said Miller-Meeks in a press release.” [Daily Iowan, 12/10/10]

2006: Miller-Meeks Was The President Of The Iowa Medical Society

2006: Miller Meeks Was The First Female President Of Iowa Medical Society. “Miller-Meeks was inaugurated as the first female president of the Iowa Medical Society in 2006. Miller-Meeks organized a physician recruitment and retention organization to help bring physicians to Southeast Iowa. She has also served as a Court Appointed Special Advocate volunteer for children and assisted families who were not able to afford health care.” [Fort Madison Daily Democrat, 10/31/14]

1997-2008: Miller-Meeks Was A Private Practice Ophthalmologist At Heartland Eye Care

1997-2008: Miller-Meeks Was A Private Practice Ophthalmologist At Heartland Eye Care. According to Mariannette Miller-Meeks’ LinkedIn page, Miller-Meeks was a private practice ophthalmologist at Heartland Eye Care. Miller-Meeks was in “private practice physician (ophthalmologist) practice performing cataract surgery, LASIK, glaucoma surgery and laser treatment of various retinal disorder” from 1999 to 2008. [Mariannette Miller-Meeks LinkedIn, accessed 1/25/22]

1983-2000: Miller-Meeks Worked In Medical Services In The United States Army Reserve


1994-1997: Miller-Meeks Was An Assistant Professor of Ophthalmology At The University Of Iowa Hospitals and Clinics

1994-1997: Miller-Meeks Was An Assistant Professor of Ophthalmology At The University Of Iowa Hospitals and Clinics. According to Mariannette Miller-Meeks’ LinkedIn page, Miller-Meeks was an Assistant Professor of Ophthalmology at the University of Iowa Hospitals and Clinics from 1994 to 1997. [Mariannette Miller-Meeks LinkedIn, accessed 1/25/22]

Miller-Meeks Was Recruited To Be The First Female Faculty Member In The Department Of Ophthalmology At The University Of Iowa. “After completing her residency in ophthalmology at the University of Iowa, Miller-Meeks joined the faculty at the University of Michigan. She was soon recruited back to the University of Iowa as the first female faculty member in the Department of Ophthalmology. During her time, Dr. Miller-Meeks authored numerous articles, presented national lectures and research, awarded the Charles Phelps Award in 1995 and received accolades as one of the country’s best doctors.” [Fort Madison Daily Democrat, 10/31/14]


Miller-Meeks Later Retired From The Army Reserves As A Lieutenant Colonel After 24 Years Of Active Duty And Army Reserve Service. “Miller-Meeks enlisted in the US Army at age 18 and retired honorably from the reserves as a Lt. Colonel. During those 24 years, active duty and reserve, she served as a private, nurse, and physician. Miller-Meeks and her husband, Curt, live in Ottumwa. They have two grown children, Jonathon and Taylor.” [Fort Madison Daily Democrat, 10/31/14]

**Criminal Record**

1997-2013: Miller-Meeks Had Twelve Traffic Violations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Case Number</th>
<th>Violation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/14/2013</td>
<td>05631PESTA0031250</td>
<td>ENTERING THROUGH HIGHWAYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/28/2010</td>
<td>06571CRSTA0082102</td>
<td>FAIL TO MAINTAIN CONTROL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/12/2008</td>
<td>08441 STA0001152</td>
<td>SPEEDING OVER 55 ZONE (6 THRU 10 OVER)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/27/2007</td>
<td>08901 STA0000867</td>
<td>FAIL TO MAINTAIN CONTROL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/28/2007</td>
<td>05201 STA0000108</td>
<td>SPEEDING 55 OR UNDER ZONE (6 THRU 10 OVER)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/13/2007</td>
<td>08901 ST145XJ0Q</td>
<td>SPEEDING OVER 55 ZONE (6 THRU 10 OVER)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/05/2006</td>
<td>08541 ST14116QS</td>
<td>SPEEDING OVER 55 ZONE (6 THRU 10 OVER)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/18/2003</td>
<td>08541 STP514133</td>
<td>SPEEDING OVER 55 ZONE (6 THRU 10 OVER)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/23/2003</td>
<td>08791 ST1124JIS</td>
<td>SPEEDING OVER 55 ZONE (6 THRU 10 OVER)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/23/1998</td>
<td>08901OTST043662</td>
<td>DNU - SPEEDING (11 - 15 OVER)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/13/1997</td>
<td>08621OSSTWG855548</td>
<td>DNU SPEEDING: 30 MPH ZONES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/01/1997</td>
<td>08901 STP523322</td>
<td>SPEEDING OVER 55 ZONE (6 THRU 10 OVER)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Iowa State Court Records Search, accessed 6/24/20]

May 2004: Miller-Meeks Was Cited With An Infraction For Going Over 20 MPH Above The Speed Limit In Virginia. According to Nexis Criminal Records Search, Miller-Meeks was given an infraction from Madison County Virginia for going 75 miles per hour, over the 55 miles per hour speed limit, on May 13, 2004. Miller-Meeks was found guilty in absentia on June 1, 2004. [Nexis Criminal Records Search, accessed 1/24/22]
NOTE: A search of Madison County, VA court records did not yield any results.

Virgin Court Report

**Offender Information**
- **Name:** MILLER-MEEKS, MARIANNE T
- **Address:** VA
- **Case Number:** 113GT0400270500
- **Case Filing Date:** 05/13/2004
- **Case Type:** INFRACTION
- **DOB:** 09/1955
- **SSN:** 456-13-XXXX
- **Race:** WHITE
- **Sex:** Female

**Court Activity**
- [NONE FOUND]

1985: Miller-Meeks Was Charged In Two Criminal Cases In North Carolina.

November 1985: Miller-Meeks Was Charged In A Criminal Case In North Carolina. According to Nexis Criminal Records Search, Miller-Meeks was charged in a criminal case in North Carolina on November 1, 1985.

NOTE: The Nexis Criminal Records Search did not provide the county where the case occurred and the North Carolina court records were only accessible by county.

![3: North Carolina Court Report](image)

NOTE: The Nexis Comprehensive Person Search did not provide the county where the case occurred and the North Carolina court records were only accessible by county.

**Associated Entities**

As of September 2021, Miller-Meeks was not associated with any known entities. [Nexis Comprehensive Person Search, accessed 9/14/21]

**Judgments Or Liens**

As of January 2022, Miller-Meeks was not associated with any known judgements or liens. [Nexis Judgements and Liens Search, accessed 1/25/22]

**Bankruptcy Filings**

As of January 2022, Miller-Meeks was not associated with any known bankruptcy filings. [Nexis Bankruptcy Filings Search, accessed 1/25/22]

**Voter Registration & History**

**Miller-Meeks Was Registered To Vote In Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District**

Miller-Meeks Was Registered To Vote In Ottumwa, IA. [Iowa Secretary of State, accessed 1/25/22; VoteBuilder, accessed 1/25/22]

- **Miller-Meeks’ Address Was Located In Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District.** [House.gov, accessed 1/25/22]

According to Iowa Secretary of State and VoteBuilder, Miller-Meeks’ voting history is as depicted below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Muni Primary</th>
<th>School Board</th>
<th>Municipal</th>
<th>Pres Primary</th>
<th>Special</th>
<th>Special Primary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Iowa Secretary of State, accessed 6/16/20; VoteBuilder, accessed 1/25/22]

**NOTE:** As of February 2022, Iowa Secretary of State and local election officials had not responded to FOIA requests sent in 2021 for Miller-Meeks’ voting history from 2020 to present. Therefore, voting records above for 2020 and 2021 reflect information found on VoteBuilder. However, voter registration information was available online without a FOIA request and is accurate to Iowa official records at the dates accessed.
### Professional Career

**Significant Findings**

- Under Miller-Meeks’ leadership, the Iowa Department of Public Health had a number of controversies.
  - Miller-Meeks signed a $20,000 settlement with an employee who lost her job but filed a grievance stating that her termination was based on politics.
  - DMR Editorial: Miller-Meeks failed to stand up for HIV-positive Iowans when a federally funded high-risk insurance pool refused to provide health insurance to Iowans that were HIV-positive.
  - The Department came under fire after a state audit report exposed the agency had failed to inspect funeral homes as required by state law; Miller-Meeks admitted IDPH had not inspected funeral homes for “decades” prior to the audit.
  - Miller-Meeks was accused of disregarding state law by not consulting the Tobacco Use Prevention and Control Commission before hiring a new administrator for the tobacco use prevention division.
    - The administrator Miller-Meeks hired had questionable qualifications, with no management experience and little background in tobacco policy or public health.
    - Miller-Meeks’ failure to consult the commission was cited by a critical legislator as evidence of her weak management skills.
  - Miller-Meeks cut the position of Iowa’s Division of Tobacco Use Prevention and Control official and said the move was due to budget cuts that left the division too small to operate alone.
    - Sen. Herman Quirmbach and anti-smoking activists questioned the move, saying Miller-Meeks had spoken of her intent to dissolve the division entirely.
    - Miller-Meeks then named IDPH’s medical director as interim administrator, but backed off when state senators noted the move violated state law requiring a full-time head of the division with no other duties.
    - Miller-Meeks claimed she had spoken to the Iowa Attorney General who said her actions were legal, but the AG’s spox said he did not advise Miller-Meeks.
  - Miller-Meeks was rejected by the Iowa Senate to serve on the Iowa Hawk-I Board due to her record as Director of the Department of Public Health.
    - Sen. Liz Mathis said Miller-Meeks was unresponsive and unhelpful when Mathis asked for her support for a bill to help Alzheimer’s patients, families and caregivers.

---

2016: Miller-Meeks Was Rejected By The Iowa Senate To Serve On The Iowa Hawk-I Board Due To Her Record As Director Of The Department Of Public Health
2016: Miller-Meeks Was Rejected By Iowa Senate To Serve On A Health Care Board Because Critics Worried She Was Too Close To The Branstad Administration. “The Iowa Senate on Thursday rejected Gov. Terry Branstad’s nomination of former state health director Mariannette Miller-Meeks to the Iowa Hawk-I Board, which advises the state on health care coverage for uninsured children of working families. Miller-Meeks needed 34 votes - a two-thirds majority - to be confirmed. Her nomination failed on a 28-18 vote…” Sen. Janet Petersen, D-Des Moines, who opposed Miller-Meeks’ confirmation, said the Hawk-I Board needs a person who will stand up for Iowa’s families and children, as opposed to someone who will stand with the Branstad administration.” [Des Moines Register, 4/16/16]

- **Hawk-I Or Hawki Is The Healthy And Well Kids In Iowa Program Offered Through The Children’s Health Insurance Program (CHIP).** “The Children’s Health Insurance Program (CHIP) is offered through the Healthy and Well Kids in Iowa program, also known as Hawki. Iowa offers Hawki health coverage for uninsured children of working families. No family pays more than $40 a month. Some families pay nothing at all. A child who qualifies for Hawki health insurance will get their health coverage through a Managed Care Organization (MCO). These are the MCOs or health plans you can choose from: Amerigroup Iowa, Inc. and Iowa Total Care.” [Iowa Department of Human Services, accessed 6/2/20]

Miller-Meeks’ Time As Head Of The Department Of Public Health Concerned Some Lawmakers. “An Iowa Senate panel agreed Monday to move Gov. Terry Branstad’s appointment of Mariannette Miller-Meeks to the state Hawk-I board to the Senate’s confirmation calendar without recommendation. Miller-Meeks, 60, served as director of the Department of Public Health under Branstad from 2011 to 2013 and three times lost to Democrat Dave Loebsack in the 2nd Congressional District. Some members of the Senate Human Resources Committee have expressed concern about her time as head of the Department of Public Health and the appointment to a board that oversees the state’s children’s health insurance program as it changes to privatized Medicaid services April 1.” [The Gazette, 3/22/16]

- **Senator Mathis, D-Linn, Said Miller-Meeks Was Unhelpful When Mathis Asked For Support On An Alzheimer’s Bill When Miller-Meeks’ Was Director Of The State Department Of Public Health.** “All 18 no votes came from Iowa Democrats, including Sen. Liz Mathis of Linn County. Mathis raised concerns about Miller-Meeks work as director of the Iowa Department of Public Health, saying she was unhelpful when Mathis asked for support on an Alzheimer’s bill. ‘When I was advocating for Alzheimer’s patients, their families and providers who care for people with dementia-related illness, (Miller-Meeks) was unresponsive to my plea and theirs for two years in a row,’ said Sen. Mathis. ‘That experience, along with other Senators who have worked with her, convinced me she is not the best choice to join the Hawk-I Board.’” [KCRG, 4/16/16]

- **Critics Said Miller-Meeks Was Not The Right Fit Because She Would “Worry About The Reduction In Services And The Bottom-Line Costs” Instead Of The Human Element.** “Critics expressed concern about her time as Branstad’s chief of the state public health agency and her appointment to a state board that provides direction to the state Department of Human Services on the state’s children’s health insurance program at a time when the governor is moving Medicaid services to privately managed care. ‘We need a Hawk-I board member that has a strong knowledge of the health insurance programs that will advocate for affordable, accessible, comprehensive care for children and not just worry about the reduction in services and the bottom-line costs, especially in this period of transition to a managed care environment,’ said Sen. Amanda Ragan, D-Mason City. ‘This is not a fit that I think is good for Hawk-I or the state of Iowa, especially in this change.’” [The Gazette, 4/15/16]

- **Gazette: “Quirmbach, D-Ames, Said Miller-Meeks Displayed Weaknesses In Her Commitment, Her Listening Skills And Her Failure To Consult With Others Regarding Personnel Decisions During His...”**
Interactions With Her When She Directed The State Department Of Public Health.” “Critics expressed concern about her time as Branstad’s chief of the state public health agency and her appointment to a state board that provides direction to the state Department of Human Services on the state’s children’s health insurance program at a time when the governor is moving Medicaid services to privately managed care. ‘We need a Hawk-I board member that has a strong knowledge of the health insurance programs that will advocate for affordable, accessible, comprehensive care for children and not just worry about the reduction in services and the bottom-line costs, especially in this period of transition to a managed care environment,’ said Sen. Amanda Ragan, D-Mason City. ‘This is not a fit that I think is good for Hawk-I or the state of Iowa, especially in this change.’ Sen. Herman Quirmbach, D-Ames, said Miller-Meeks displayed weaknesses in her commitment, her listening skills and her failure to consult with others regarding personnel decisions during his interactions with her when she directed the state Department of Public Health.” [The Gazette, 4/15/16]

Iowa Hawk-I Board Advised The State On Health Care Coverage For Uninsured Children Of Working Families

Iowa Hawk-I Board Advised The State On Health Care Coverage For Uninsured Children Of Working Families. “The Iowa Senate on Thursday rejected Gov. Terry Branstad’s nomination of former state health director Mariannette Miller-Meeks to the Iowa Hawk-I Board, which advises the state on health care coverage for uninsured children of working families. Miller-Meeks needed 34 votes - a two-thirds majority - to be confirmed. Her nomination failed on a 28-18 vote…Sen. Janet Petersen, D-Des Moines, who opposed Miller-Meeks’ confirmation, said the Hawk-I Board needs a person who will stand up for Iowa’s families and children, as opposed to someone who will stand with the Branstad administration.” [Des Moines Register, 4/16/16]

2011-2014: Miller-Meeks Served As Director Of Iowa Department Of Public Health

January 2014: Miller-Meeks Resigned As Director Of The Iowa Department Of Public Health. “Iowa's top public-health official, who was criticized this week for unsubstantiated comments about food stamps, has resigned. Dr. Mariannette Miller-Meeks' resignation was announced this morning by Gov. Terry Branstad. ‘It is with regret that I accept Mariannette's resignation, as she was a director who served with great passion,’ the governor said in a press release. ‘Mariannette has been a champion of health in Iowa, including working to promote our Healthiest State Initiative. Lieutenant Governor Reynolds and I thank her for her service to the people of Iowa.’ The Ottumwa ophthalmologist had been director of the Iowa Department of Public Health since Branstad took office three years ago.” [Des Moines Register, 1/9/14]

Miller-Meeks Said She Served As Director Of Iowa Department Of Public Health From 2011-2013. According to Mariannette Miller-Meeks' LinkedIn page, Miller-Meeks served as Director of Iowa Department of Public Health from 2011 to 2013. [Mariannette Miller-Meeks LinkedIn, accessed 1/25/22]

Miller-Meeks Resigned Because She Was Planned On Running For Congress

Miller-Meeks Resigned Because She was Planned On Running For Congress. The director of the Iowa Department of Public Health has resigned because she plans to run for Congress; Gov. Terry Branstad said Thursday. Mariannette Miller-Meeks recently faced criticism for a comment she made about food stamps. Branstad said he did not seek her resignation and said it had nothing to do with the remark. ‘I know what she’s intending to do,’ Branstad told reporters at the Capitol. And when reporters asked whether Miller-Meeks planned to run for the U.S. House from Iowa’s 2nd District for the third time, the governor acknowledged she would be doing just that.” [Hawk Eye, 1/10/14]

Miller-Meeks’ Resignation Was Accepted By Gov. Terry Branstad

Miller-Meeks’ Resignation Was Accepted By Gov. Terry Branstad. Miller-Meeks has run the health department since Gov. Terry Branstad took office in 2011. He announced her resignation in a press release this morning.: ‘It is
with regret that I accept Mariannette’s resignation, as she was a director who served with great passion,’ Branstad wrote. ‘Mariannette has been a champion of health in Iowa, including working to promote our Healthiest State Initiative. Lieutenant Governor Reynolds and I thank her for her service to the people of Iowa.’” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 1/9/14]

2012: Miller-Meeks Received $135,000 Salary As Director Of The Iowa Department of Public Health

“Mariannette Miller-Meeks, director of the Iowa Department of Public Health: $135,000.” [Des Moines Register, 11/2/12]

Miller-Meeks Was Appointed Director Of The Iowa Department Of Public Health By Gov. Branstad

December 2010: Iowa Governor-Elect Terry Branstad Appointed Miller-Meeks As The Head Of The Iowa Department Of Public Health. “Iowa Gov.-elect Terry Branstad appointed former Congressional candidate Mariannette Miller-Meeks as the head of the Iowa Department of Public Health Thursday. Miller-Meeks, the first female faculty member in the University of Iowa ophthalmology department, will head the agency that works with local health organizations, lawmakers, and health-care providers to educate Iowa citizens on health. ‘I am honored to have been chosen by Gov. Branstad and Lt.-Gov.-elect Reynolds to head the Iowa Department of Public Health,’ said Miller-Meeks in a press release.” [Daily Iowan, 12/10/10]

Miller-Meeks Was Appointed Director Of The Iowa Department Of Public Health By Gov. Branstad. “Today we have announced that Dr. Mariannette Miller-Meeks will be the head of the Iowa Department of Public Health,” said Branstad. “Dr. Miller-Meeks’ dedication to public health is evident from her service and leadership in various medical organizations, and I look forward to working with her as we work to make Iowa the healthiest state in the nation.’” [The Ottumwa Courier, 12/10/10]

Des Moines Register Editorial: Miller-Meeks Had “Little To Say” About Affordable Care Act Implementation, Despite Her Role

Des Moines Register Editorial: Miller-Meeks Had “Little To Say” About Affordable Care Act Implementation, Despite Her Role. “As a massive health reform law was being implemented, she had little to say. This was surprising, as health insurance is such an important part of her agency’s mission to ‘promote and protect public health.’ Her silence is notable, too, because she was uninsured during her 2010 campaign for Congress.” [Des Moines Register, Editorial Board, 1/13/14]

HEADLINE: The Register's Editorial: “Health Chief Needs To Be A Voice For Public.” [Des Moines Register, Editorial Board, 1/13/14]

IDPH Controversies While Miller-Meeks Served As Director

Miller-Meeks Signed A $20,000 Settlement With An Employee Who Lost Her Job But Filed A Grievance Stating That Her Termination Was Based On Politics

Miller-Meeks Signed A $20,000 Settlement With An Employee Who Lost Her Job But Filed A Grievance Stating That Her Termination Was Based On Politics. “You can appreciate the state budget is a $7 billion enterprise and certainly the governor is not going to be involved in approving all the expenditures,’ said Gerd Clabaugh, the health department’s interim director. Clabaugh was the boss of one employee who lost her job in 2012 because of what the administration called a reorganization. However, the employee, Pam Deichmann, claimed
in a grievance filed against the state that her termination was based on her politics and support for tougher hospital reporting standards of infections. Former health department director Mariannette Miller-Meeks signed Dieckmann’s $20,000 settlement. Miller-Meeks, who resigned in January to run for the U.S. House, on Monday declined to talk about whether she discussed the matter with Branstad.” [Des Moines Register, 3/18/14]

- **Des Moines Register:** “Employees Claimed They Had Lost Their Jobs Because Of Republican Cronyism.” “Lt. Gov. Kim Reynolds said Monday that neither she nor Gov. Terry Branstad was aware of six secret settlements paid to former state employees until they read it in Sunday’s Des Moines Register. Most of the employees claimed they had lost their jobs because of Republican cronyism. The Register’s report also revealed the six were asked to sign unenforceable confidentiality agreements that seemingly prohibited them from speaking about the settlements.” [Des Moines Register, 3/18/14]

**Miller-Meeks Failed To Stand Up For HIV-Positive Iowans When A Federally Funded High Risk Insurance Pool Refused To Provide Health Insurance Iowans That Were HIV-Positive**

DMR Editorial: Miller-Meeks Failed To Stand Up For HIV-Positive Iowans When A Federally Funded High Risk Insurance Pool Refused To Provide Health Insurance Iowans That Were HIV-Positive. “The Department of Public Health has a bureau to connect HIV-positive Iowans to drugs and care. Miller-Meeks should have been expressing outrage when a federally funded high risk insurance pool refused to provide health insurance to these Iowans as was intended.” [Des Moines Register, Editorial Board, 1/13/14]

**Miller-Meeks’ Department Of Health Came Under Fire After A State Audit Report Exposed The Agency For Not Inspecting Funeral Homes That Was Required By State Law**

Miller-Meeks Said The State Had Not Inspected Funeral Homes For Decades, Leaving It To Cities And Counties To Regulate. “A state auditor’s report on the Iowa Department of Public Health released Wednesday criticized the agency for failing to inspect funeral homes as required by state law. […] ‘We take it seriously, and we’re working on a process of trying to amend the code,’ said Iowa Public Health Director Mariannette Miller-Meeks. She said the state hasn’t inspected funeral homes for decades, leaving it to cities and counties to handle through local ordinances.” [The Hawk Eye, 8/15/13]

Miller-Meeks Said The Agency Typically Relied On Local Government And OSHA Regulations. “She said her agency wants the authority to inspect funeral homes if concerns arise but typically rely on local government and the federal Occupational Safety and Health Administration regulations to oversee the operations. Auditors said the agency also has not performed the required inspections of hair salons every two years as outlined in the state code.” [The Hawk Eye, 8/15/13]

- **The Hawk Eye:** Iowa Code Requires The Department To Inspect “All Places Where Dead Human Bodies Are Prepared Or Held For Burial, Entombment Or Cremation.” “In the public health report, the auditors said the Iowa Code requires the department to inspect ‘all places where dead human bodies are prepared or held for burial, entombment or cremation.’ The law gives the department the authority to adopt and enforce rules for inspections ‘necessary for the preservation of the public health.’ In June, the Board of Mortuary Science recommended changing the law to say the department may inspect the facilities instead of shall inspect them, department spokeswoman Polly Carver-Kimm said.” [The Hawk Eye, 8/15/13]

**Miller-Meeks Was Accused Of Disregarding State Law By Not Consulting The Tobacco Use Prevention and Control Commission Before Hiring A New Administrator For The Tobacco Use Prevention Division**

Miller-Meeks Was Accused Of Disregarding State Law By Not Consulting The Tobacco Use Prevention and Control Commission Before Hiring A New Administrator For The Tobacco Use Prevention Division. “Sen. Herman Quirmbach, D-Ames, a non-voting member of the commission, opened the meeting with a critique of
O’Brien’s hiring. […] Friday’s meeting of the Tobacco Use Prevention and Control Commission, which oversees the division, was her first formal introduction in that role. […] Iowa Department of Public Health Director Mariannette Miller-Meeks is empowered to appoint the division administrator, but state law calls for the commission to advise in the evaluation of candidates for the job and to consult with the public health director on hiring. The commission was not able to adequately review the applicants for the position, Quirmbach argued, and Miller-Meeks disregarded the preliminary recommendation by two commission members suggesting selection of another candidate.” [The Gazette, 7/22/12]

**The Position Was Administrator For The Division Of Tobacco Use Prevention And Control.** “A state senator questioned the qualifications of the woman recently hired as Iowa’s top tobacco control official and accused the state’s public health director of obstructing the law governing her hiring during a contentious meeting Friday. Meghan O’Brien was hired as the administrator for the Division of Tobacco Use Prevention and Control this month after an informal search process.” [The Gazette, 7/22/12]

Miller-Meeks Did Have The Choice To Hire Who She Wanted But Not Consulting The Commission Was Considered Evidence Of Miller-Meeks Weak Management Skills. “The ultimate choice (of who to hire) is up to the director, that’s clear under the code,’ Quirmbach said. ‘But this commission has not been afforded the opportunity to carry out its legal responsibility, and I fault the director of the Department of Public Health in that regard.’ In a later interview, Quirmbach called the manner in which the hiring played out ‘evidence of the weakness of Miller-Meeks’ own management skills.’ Miller-Meeks, however, said she consulted with the Iowa Attorney General’s Office and received assurances that the process that led to O’Brien’s hiring followed state law. The opportunities she gave to commission members to meet candidates were, in fact, ‘overly generous,’ she said.” [The Gazette, 7/22/12]

Miller-Meeks Had Narrowed The Choices Down To Two Finalists Which The Commission’s Chairwoman And Vice Chairman Recommended Hiring The Other Finalist. “The administrator position came open this spring, when Interim Director Aaron Swanson left for another job. Several people applied, from which two -- including O’Brien -- were selected as finalists by Miller-Meeks. The commission’s chairwoman and vice chairman met both candidates and recommended hiring the other finalist, but no candidates were formally vetted by the full commission.” [The Gazette, 7/22/12]

The New Hire Was Questioned For Her Qualification For The Job, Citing No Management Experience And Little Background In Tobacco Policy Or Public Health. “Miller-Meeks formally hired O’Brien about two weeks ago. Beyond the process by which O’Brien was hired, Quirmbach also questioned her qualifications for the top job in the division. She has no management experience and little background in tobacco policy or public health, he said. Not everyone on the commission shared Quirmbach’s concerns.” [The Gazette, 7/22/12]

**Miller-Meeks Cut The Position Of Iowa’s Division Of Tobacco Use Prevention and Control Official And The Move Was Due To Budget Cuts, Leaving The Division Too Small To Operate Alone**

Miller-Meeks Cut The Position Of Iowa’s Division Of Tobacco Use Prevention and Control Official And The Move Was Due To Budget Cuts, Leaving The Division Too Small To Operate Alone. “Iowa’s top tobacco-control official has lost her job after her division’s budget was cut by two-thirds. Bonnie Mapes, 60, headed the Division of Tobacco Use Prevention and Control since 2004. She took early retirement after her boss, Public Health Director Mariannette Miller-Meeks, told her last month that her position was being cut. Mapes, whose 2010 salary was $99,189, and Miller-Meeks said Monday that the move was due to the Legislature’s decision to cut the division’s budget from $7.8 million to $2.8 million, leaving an agency that was too small to require a full-time director.” [Des Moines Register, 8/2/11]
Democrat State Senator Quirmbach Was Dismayed At The Dismissal, Saying He Had Heard That Miller-Meeks Had Planned On Disbanding The Tobacco Prevention Entirely And Had Little Interest In Developing Effective Policy

Democrat State Senator Quirmbach Was Dismayed At The Dismissal, Saying He Had Heard That Miller-Meeks Had Planned On Disbanding The Tobacco Prevention Entirely And Had Little Interest In Developing Effective Policy. “Sen. Herman Quirmbach, D-Ames and a strident anti-smoking voice, complained about the development in a letter released Monday by his staff. Quirmbach called the move a ‘firing’ and wrote that he was ‘dismayed.’ ‘Miller-Meeks has told some members of the Tobacco Use Prevention and Control Commission that she intends to seek legislation to disband the division entirely and that she has little interest in developing effective tobacco control policy, despite a statutory responsibility to do so,’ he wrote.” [Des Moines Register, 8/2/11]

Miller-Meeks Said Talk About Folding The Division Duties Into The Health Department Had Been Going On For A While And She Needed To Fit Anti-Smoking Into A Tight Budget. “Miller-Meeks said Monday that her decision to cut the division director’s position was no reflection of Mapes’ job performance. She said state leaders had been talking for several years about folding the division’s duties into other parts of the health department, and she might ask legislators next session for authority to do so. Miller-Meeks said she needs to fit anti-smoking efforts into a tight budget, and it made more sense to focus the limited dollars on such things as the Quitline Iowa counseling program and local anti-smoking organizations rather than a separate state division.” [Des Moines Register, 8/2/11]

Anti-Smoking Lobbyists Questioned The Dismissal, Saying The Move Questioned How Serious The Governor Was Opposition On Smoking. “Threase Harms, a Des Moines lobbyist for the anti-smoking group Clean Air for Everyone, said Mapes’ dismissal raises questions about how serious Branstad is about his frequently stated opposition to smoking. ‘If they want Iowa to be the healthiest state in the nation, how are we going to do that without addressing the No. 1 cause of preventable deaths?’ she said.” [Des Moines Register, 8/2/11]

Gov. Branstad Had Signed Off On Miller-Meeks’ Decision To Terminate The Position. “Tim Albrecht, a spokesman for Branstad, said the governor is committed to combating smoking. He said the governor signed off on Miller-Meeks’ decision to terminate Mapes’ position, and he said the governor understood the need to cut programs, including the anti-smoking ads. Given Iowa’s severe budget constraints, most departments and agencies saw a decrease in funding,” Albrecht wrote. ‘Gov. Branstad believes tobacco cessation programs are important and necessary, and believes the money should be spent in a more effective manner.” [Des Moines Register, 8/2/11]

Miller-Meeks Proceeded To Name The Health Department Medical Director As Interim Administrator, Which Was Illegal Under Iowa Law

Miller-Meeks Proceeded To Name The Health Department Medical Director As Interim Administrator. “The budget cuts also led to a personnel dust-up after Branstad’s public health director, Dr. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, recently dismissed Bonnie Mapes, the administrator of the tobacco-control division. Miller-Meeks said the $99,000-per-year position was no longer needed because the division had shrunk, and she named Dr. Patricia Quinlisk as interim administrator. Quinlisk, the health department’s medical director, also oversees such things as efforts to combat infectious diseases and food-poisoning outbreaks.” [Des Moines Register, 8/6/11]

Miller-Meeks Backed Off The Plan When State Senators Cited Iowa Code That Said The Anti-Tobacco Division Must Have A Full-Time Administrator Whose Sole Duties Were Running The Division. “Miller-Meeks said Friday evening that she would back off the plan, about eight hours after two state senators complained at the commission meeting that the personnel shift was illegal. Sens. Herman Quirmbach and Jack Hatch noted a section of Iowa Code specifying that the health department must employ a full-time administrator for its anti-tobacco division and that the administrator’s sole duties must be running the division.” [Des Moines Register, 8/6/11]
Miller-Meeks Claimed She Had Spoken To The Iowa Attorney General Who Said Her Actions Were Legal But The AG Said He Did Not Advise Miller-Meeks. “There is a law, and everybody has to obey the law,” said Quirmbach, an Ames Democrat. ‘I have to obey the law. Dr. Miller-Meeks has to obey the law. The governor has to obey the law.’ Miller-Meeks, who was not at the meeting, responded in a statement later Friday that she had checked with the attorney general’s office, which told her the actions were legal. Later Friday afternoon, a spokesman for Attorney General Tom Miller disagreed. ‘We feel the statute is very clear. We did not advise that an Iowa Department of Public Health employee with significant other duties could serve as the tobacco division administrator,” said the spokesman, Geoff Greenwood.” [Des Moines Register, 8/6/11]

Miller-Meeks Was Investigating The Director Of The Iowa State Nursing Board When The Director Suddenly Retired.

“Miller-Meeks said Chris Newell, an associate director of the nursing board, also has left with little explanation. Lorinda Inman, executive director of the Iowa Board of Nursing since 1988, chose to retire after state officials investigated complaints about human resources issues. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, director of the Iowa Department of Public Health, said her department and the Department of Administrative Services looked into ‘a few random complaints.’ After the investigation, Inman, who is 63, chose to retire. She did not immediately return calls.” [The Gazette, 2/26/13]

Miller-Meeks Declined To Be More Specific About The Investigation. “‘Miller-Meeks noted that the board is ‘quasi-independent’ from the health department, but she said the department helps with some of its administrative tasks, including human resources. Gov. Terry Branstad appoints members. His spokesman said he would have no comment.” [The Gazette, 2/26/13]

Des Moines Register: “‘Miller-Meeks stressed that the allegations did not involve licensing issues or regulation of the tens of thousands of Iowa nurses overseen by the agency. […] Miller-Meeks noted that the board is ‘quasi-independent’ from the health department, but she said the department helps with some of its administrative tasks, including human resources. Gov. Terry Branstad appoints members of the nursing board, but his spokesman, Tim Albrecht, said the governor’s office would have no comment. Inman, 63, was paid $108,946 last year, state records show.” [Des Moines Register, 2/26/13]

2006: Miller-Meeks Was The President Of The Iowa Medical Society

2006: Miller Meeks Was The First Female President Of Iowa Medical Society. “Miller-Meeks was inaugurated as the first female president of the Iowa Medical Society in 2006. Miller-Meeks organized a physician recruitment and retention organization to help bring physicians to Southeast Iowa. She has also served as a Court Appointed Special Advocate volunteer for children and assisted families who were not able to afford health care.” [Fort Madison Daily Democrat, 10/31/14]

1997-2008: Miller-Meeks Was A Private Practice Ophthalmologist At Heartland Eye Care

1997-2008: Miller-Meeks Was A Private Practice Ophthalmologist At Heartland Eye Care. According to Mariannette Miller-Meeks’ LinkedIn page, Miller-Meeks was a private practice ophthalmologist at Heartland Eye Care. Miller-Meeks was in “private practice physician (ophthalmologist) practice performing cataract surgery, LASIK, glaucoma surgery and laser treatment of various retinal disorder” from 1999 to 2008. [Mariannette Miller-Meeks LinkedIn, accessed 1/25/22]

1994-1997: Miller-Meeks Was An Assistant Professor of Ophthalmology At The University Of Iowa Hospitals and Clinics. According to Mariannette Miller-Meeks’ LinkedIn page, Miller-Meeks was an Assistant Professor of Ophthalmology at the University of Iowa Hospitals and Clinics from 1994 to 1997. [Mariannette Miller-Meeks LinkedIn, accessed 1/25/22]

Miller-Meeks Was Recruited To Be The First Female Faculty Member In The Department Of Ophthalmology At The University Of Iowa. “After completing her residency in ophthalmology at the University of Iowa, Miller-Meeks joined the faculty at the University of Michigan. She was soon recruited back to the University of Iowa as the first female faculty member in the Department of Ophthalmology. During her time, Dr. Miller-Meeks authored numerous articles, presented national lectures and research, awarded the Charles Phelps Award in 1995 and received accolades as one of the country’s best doctors.” [Fort Madison Daily Democrat, 10/31/14]


Miller-Meeks Later Retired From The Army Reserves As A Lieutenant Colonel After 24 Years Of Active Duty And Army Reserve Service. “Miller-Meeks enlisted in the US Army at age 18 and retired honorably from the reserves as a Lt. Colonel. During those 24 years, active duty and reserve, she served as a private, nurse, and physician. Miller-Meeks and her husband, Curt, live in Ottumwa. They have two grown children, Jonathon and Taylor.” [Fort Madison Daily Democrat, 10/31/14]
Political Career

This section provides an overview of Miller-Meeks’ political career, from 2008 to 2022.

Significant Findings

✓ Miller-Meeks won the 2020 election for Iowa’s 2nd District seat by a margin of just six votes, or 0.0016% of the two-way vote, over Democratic candidate Rita Hart.

✓ Miller-Meeks questioned the official results of the election as confirmed by recounts and precinct audits, claiming in June 2021 that she won by a larger margin and that “six is what they cheated me down to.”

✓ In December 2020, Miller-Meeks gave conflicting statements saying both that every legal ballot in her race was counted and that there were votes in her favor that were not counted.

✓ Citing a “haphazard” state recount, Hart filed an electoral challenge in the U.S. House in December 2020, forcing Miller-Meeks to be seated provisionally the following month; Hart did not withdraw her election challenge and concede to Miller-Meeks until March 2021.

✓ Hart’s campaign identified 22 ballots they believed were legally cast but wrongly uncounted.

✓ Miller-Meeks accused Democrats challenging her victory of engaging in a “disinformation campaign” and threatening the public’s faith in elections.

✓ Miller-Meeks lost three prior runs for Congress, losing to Rep. Dave Loebsack in 2008 (by 19%), 2010 and 2014 (both by 5.2%).

✓ Miller-Meeks has loaned her state and federal campaigns a total of $840,829 from her personal wealth, including $195,000 loaned to her 2020 campaign.

✓ After Iowa’s new congressional maps were finalized, Miller-Meeks announced plans to run in the new 1st District, though her Ottumwa home was not within the new district; Miller-Meeks said she planned to establish a new residence within the district lines.

Attendance Record

January 2021-February 2022: Miller-Meeks Missed 1.6% Of Roll Call Votes. “From Jan 2021 to Feb 2022, Miller-Meeks missed 8 of 494 roll call votes, which is 1.6%. This is on par with the median of 2.1% among the lifetime records of representatives currently serving.” [Govtrack.us, accessed 2/21/22]

Committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U.S. Congress</th>
<th>Committees</th>
<th>Subcommittees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2021-2022</td>
<td>Education &amp; Labor</td>
<td>Higher Education &amp; Workforce Investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Workforce Protections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committees</td>
<td>Subcommittees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeland Security</td>
<td>Emergency Preparedness, Response, &amp; Recovery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans’ Affairs</td>
<td>Transportation &amp; Maritime Security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select Subcommittee on the Coronavirus Crisis</td>
<td>Disability Assistance &amp; Memorial Affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Note:** Committees and subcommittees listed in italics represent chairmanships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Committees</th>
<th>Subcommittees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019-Present</td>
<td>Appropriations</td>
<td>Health and Human Services Appropriations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subcommittee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-Present</td>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-Present</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-Present</td>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-Present</td>
<td>Veterans Affairs (Vice Chair)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 2019-June 2019</td>
<td>Governmental Public Health Advisory Council</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 2019-July 2019</td>
<td>Review Committee for DHS for Waiver Implementation</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Iowa Legislature, accessed 6/23/20]

**Caucuses**

Miller-Meeks is a member of, but not limited to, the following caucuses:

- Aluminum Caucus
- Appalachian Caucus
- Army Caucus
- Biodefense Caucus
- Biofuels Caucus
- Bus Caucus
- Conservative Climate Caucus
- Friends of Denmark Caucus
- For Country Caucus
- General Aviation Caucus
- GOP Doctors Caucus
- GOP Healthy Futures Task Force
- Grid Innovation Caucus
- Main Street Caucus
- Mental Health Caucus
- Motorcycle Caucus
- Pro-Life Caucus
- Rare Disease Caucus
- Republican Governance Group
- Rural Broadband Caucus
- Small Business Caucus
- Sportsmen's Caucus
- Steel Caucus
• Suburban Caucus
• Taiwan Caucus
• Telehealth Caucus
• Western Caucus
• Women, Peace, and Security Caucus


June 2021: Miller-Meeks Joined The Republican Main Street Partnership, A Centrist-Learning GOP Organization With An Affiliated Super PAC. “The Republican Main Street Partnership, a centrist-leaning GOP organization that includes an affiliated super PAC, has tapped former Oregon Rep. Greg Walden as an outside adviser as it seeks to raise more than it ever has, $25 million, in the 2022 election cycle. […] Other new members include Kentucky’s Andy Barr; New Jersey’s Jeff Van Drew, who switched his party affiliation from Democrat to Republican in 2019; California’s Jay Obernolte; Iowa’s Ashley Hinson and Mariannette Miller-Meeks; New York’s Chris Jacobs; Texas’ Michael McCaul and Tony Gonzales; and Utah’s Blake D. Moore.” [Roll Call, 6/24/21]

Campaigns

Election History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>2-Way Results</th>
<th>Miller-Meeks Margin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>U.S. House (IA-02) General</td>
<td>Mariannette Miller-Meeks (R)</td>
<td>50.0008%</td>
<td>+0.0016% (six votes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rita Hart (D)</td>
<td>49.9992%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>U.S. House (IA-02) Primary</td>
<td>Bobby Schilling (R)</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mariannette Miller-Meeks (R)</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>+13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>State Senate (Iowa-41)</td>
<td>Mariannette Miller-Meeks (R)</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>+3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mary Stewart (D)</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>U.S. House (IA-02)</td>
<td>Mariannette Miller-Meeks (R)</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>-5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dave Loebsack (D)</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>U.S. House (IA-02)</td>
<td>Mariannette Miller-Meeks (R)</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>-5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dave Loebsack (D)</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>U.S. House (IA-02)</td>
<td>Mariannette Miller-Meeks (R)</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>-19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dave Loebsack (D)</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Iowa Secretary of State, 11/4/08; 11/2/10; 11/4/14; 11/6/18; 6/29/20; 11/3/20]

2022 Campaign

Miller-Meeks Announced She Would Run For Reelection In Iowa’s New First Congressional District. “I’m running for re-election in Iowa’s 1st District! I’m committed to standing up to Washington Democrats and their Socialist Agenda by doing everything in my power to fight for Iowan common sense values. Donate today to help me Take Back the House! #ia01” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 11/10/21]

• Miller-Meeks Said She Planned To Establish A Residence In The New First District But Would Not Sell Her Home In Ottumwa. “While there’s no requirement that members of congress live within the boundaries of the district they represent — they just have to live within the state — four of Iowa’s congressmen moved after district lines were redrawn in 2001 and 2011. Miller-Meeks, a Republican, won’t be selling her home in Ottumwa, but does plan to establish a residence in the new first district. ‘I have a variety of housing options,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘I’ll be able to be in the district and live within the district.’” [Radio Iowa, 12/20/21]
PolitiFact Iowa: Miller-Meeks’ Claim That Bohannan Wanted To Abolish Law Enforcement Was “False.” “Miller-Meeks said Bohannan wants to abolish law enforcement. She supports her statement with The Washington Free Beacon article and her explanation that where someone puts their money reflects their values. The donation, however, was to a bail and bond project, not a law enforcement abolition plan. Bohannan has made statements on the Iowa House floor and in an op-ed, saying she supports law enforcement, which PolitiFact finds to be more relevant than the 2019 Facebook donation to the Prairielands Freedom Fund. For these reasons, we rate the claim that Bohannan supports abolishing law enforcement False.” [PolitiFact Iowa, 9/17/21]

Miller-Meeks Claimed Bohannan Wanted To “Abolish” Law Enforcement. “I support law enforcement. My opponent wants to abolish them. The choice is clear:” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 9/8/21]

Miller-Meeks: Bohannan’s “Vision Of The Future” Was “More Division And Social Unrest, Less Support For Law Enforcement, And Less Personal Freedom For Those Of Us Who Play By The Rules.” “In a statement released Tuesday, Miller-Meeks welcomed Bohannan to the race, but criticized her opposition to a ban on mask mandates and a so-called ‘Back the Blue’ bill. ‘I am certain that the voters of Iowa’s Second Congressional District want a congresswoman who has proven her commitment to building a better future for working families, Iowa and the nation rather than one whose vision of the future is more division and social unrest, less support for law enforcement, and less personal freedom for those of us who play by the rules,’ Miller-Meeks’ statement reads in part.” [Iowa Public Radio, 8/24/21]

Miller-Meeks Criticized Bohannan’s Vote Against Iowa’s “Back The Blue” Legislation, Saying It Was “Disturbing And Disappointing.” “Miller-Meeks also criticized her vote against the ‘Back the Blue’ legislation passed in the Iowa Legislature. ‘She has voted against more funding for law enforcement that keeps us safe when she voted against the Back the Blue legislation. This legislation increased penalties for rioting, public disorder, blocking a roadway, harassing peace officers, damaging public property and disorderly conduct. That vote alone is disturbing and disappointing considering that Representative Bohannan, as a member of the University of Iowa faculty, would have seen firsthand the destructive aftermath of last year’s supposedly peaceful protesters that inflicted more than $1 million in damage on Iowa’s Old Capitol, the Field House and numerous other buildings on campus and dangerously blocked traffic on Interstate 80,’ she stated.” [Iowa Torch, 8/25/21]

Advertisements

September 2021: Tax March And Other Progressive Nonprofits Launched A $2 Million Ad Campaign To Pressure Miller-Meeks And Other Republican Lawmakers To Back Biden’s Agenda. “Several progressive groups are launching a $2 million campaign to pressure Republican lawmakers up for reelection in key states to back President Joe Biden’s agenda. Led by Tax March, progressive nonprofit organizations will be holding protests and running ads versus GOP representatives in states such as Ohio and Wisconsin. […] The new campaign will be taking aim at Republicans in the key states of Iowa, Ohio, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin. The campaign looks specifically to pressure Reps. Mariannette Jane Miller-Meeks, R-Iowa, Brian Fitzpatrick, R-Pa., Steve Chabot, R-Ohio and Sen. Ron Johnson, R-Wis., organizers said. The lawmakers are all up for reelection next year.” [CNBC, 9/20/21]

August 2021: The DCCC Launched An Iowa Billboard Campaign Criticizing Miller-Meeks For Opposing The House Select Committee Investigation Into The January 6th Insurrection. “DCCC launched an Iowa billboard campaign taking Rep. Ashley Hinson and Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks to task for opposing the bipartisan committee investigating the deadly Jan. 6 insurrection at the U.S. Capitol. Miller Meeks broke with Republicans to support a bipartisan independent commission, but did not support the House Select Committee investigation, which also has Republican members.” [Daily Nonpareil, 8/22/21]

February 2021: Tax March Ran An Ad Campaign Calling Out Miller-Meeks For Her Opposition To Biden’s COVID Relief Package. “A new ad campaign led by the progressive group Tax March calls out Iowa U.S. Rep.
Mariannette Miller-Meeks, R-Iowa, for her opposition to President Joe Biden's $1.9 trillion COVID relief package. Miller-Meeks last week voted against a budget resolution that could clear the way for Biden's coronavirus relief package. Miller-Meeks, in a statement following her vote, criticized Democrats for pushing forward 'partisan issues such as a national $15/hour minimum wage, which would kill thousands of jobs across the country and in southeastern Iowa, and bailouts for state governments, such as Illinois, who have mismanaged their budgets,' rather than working in a bipartisan manner to address the pandemic and 'deliver real, targeted relief for our constituents.’ [...] Tax March, in a press release, argues Miller-Meeks ‘is leaving Iowa families who need massive economic relief high and dry,’ while standing firm in her commitment to protecting the Trump tax cuts for billionaires and corporations. Supporters of the Iowa ad campaign include: Iowa Federation of Labor, AFL-CIO; Iowa Alliance for Retired Americans; Indivisible-Iowa; Progress Iowa; Americans for Democratic Action-Iowa; Iowa Citizen Action Network; Tax March Iowa; Iowa Main Street Alliance; and Lower Drug Prices Now Iowa.’ [Quad-City Times, 2/10/21]

- **Cedar Rapids Gazette Gave The Claim That Miller-Meeks Supported Tax Breaks For Billionaires A “D” Grade Due To Her Not Being Seated In Congress For Votes On The Trump Tax Cuts In Its Fact Check.** ‘Claim 2: ‘Even though there's only one billionaire in Iowa, Mariannette Miller-Meeks supports giving billionaires huge tax breaks for private jets and yachts.’ According to Forbes' interactive billionaire map, Iowa's only billionaire is Harry Stine, the founder of Stine Seeds. Stine lives in Adel, which is not part of Miller-Meeks' district. The ad cites a 2018 Business Insider article about former President Donald Trump's tax plan allowing private jet buyers to deduct 100 percent of the cost from their taxes. Miller-Meeks was not in Congress when the tax bill became law in 2017 and therefore did not vote on it and likely had no say on the private jet and yacht tax breaks. Nikki Haley, the former U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, said Oct. 21 while campaigning with Miller Meeks that the Ottumwa Republican would work to preserve the Trump tax cuts, according to a Quad-City Times article. Trump's tax reform law had many components to it, so that doesn't necessarily mean she supports 'huge tax breaks' for private jets and yachts. We give this claim a D.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 3/1/21]

- **Cedar Rapids Gazette Gave The Claim That Miller-Meeks Voted Against Sending Relief To Iowans Who Had Lost Their Jobs An “A” Grade In Its Fact Check.** ‘Claim 3: ‘But for Iowans who lost their job, she voted against sending more relief.’ It references a Feb. 3 budget resolution that cleared the way for Democrats to pass Biden's COVID-19 relief bill. Biden's relief bill includes $1,400 direct payments to each tax filer and their dependents, unemployment assistance and about $350 billion in aid for local, state and tribal governments. Miller-Meeks, along with Iowa's two other Republican representatives, voted against the resolution. 'I am disappointed that Congressional leaders brought a partisan budget resolution to the floor costing $1.9 trillion of taxpayer dollars,’ Miller-Meeks told the Quad-City Times. She said Democrats were pushing 'partisan issues' like a higher minimum wage and 'bailouts for state governments.’ While Miller-Meeks voted against sending more relief, she co-signed a letter to Biden on Jan. 20 about wanting to work with him on 'targeted, meaningful coronavirus relief.’ We give this claim an A.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 3/1/21]

### Campaign Finance

**Q4 2021: Miller-Meeks’ Campaign Raised $457,000 And Had $1.83 Million Cash On Hand.** “Scoop: Thanks in no part to @marceelias’s attempts to throw her out of office, #IA01’s @millermeeks raised $457,000 in Q4, bringing her total COH to $1,830,000 This is the most COH by any other Republican Congressional in Iowa” [Twitter, @MatthewFoldi, 1/19/22]

**Q3 2021: Miller-Meeks’ Campaign Raised $400,000 And Had $1.5 Million Cash On Hand.** “IA-02: Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (R) raised $400,000 in Q3 and had $1.5 million cash on hand entering October, according to figures first shared with Hotline. (Hotline reporting)” [National Journal, 10/8/21]

**Q2 2021: Miller-Meeks’ Campaign Raised More Than $480,000 And Had More Than $1.1 Million Cash On Hand.** “TRIPLE M: Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, the Iowa Republican who won her hotly contested House seat
by just six votes, raised over $480,000 in the second quarter, according to her campaign. She has over $1.1 million in the bank.” [Politico, 7/8/21]

Q1 2021: Miller-Meeks’ Campaign Raised More Than $531,000 And Had More Than $770,000 Cash On Hand. “Yesterday, it was announced that Mariannette Miller-Meeks raised over $531,000 with more than $770,000 cash on hand in the first quarter. ‘These numbers show the strength, enthusiasm and support of GOP incumbents right now,’ said Republican Party of Iowa Communications Director Kollin Crompton. ‘While the Biden Administration is failing to keep our Southern border secure and paying off their debts to the progressive wing of the Democrat party, Republicans are creating a solid foundation for 2022. We have the opportunity to take back the House and the Senate and put this country back on track.’” [Iowa Republican Party, Press Release, 4/7/21]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2020 Election Results &amp; Legal Battle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

November 2020: Miller-Meeks Claimed Victory Over Hart While Votes Were Still Being Counted And The Race Was In Statistical Dead Heat

November 2020: After Pulling Ahead Late On Election Day, Miller-Meeks Declared Victory With A Margin Of 282 Votes, Despite A Possible Recount. “Republican state Sen. Mariannette Miller-Meeks of Ottumwa has declared victory with some votes yet to be counted and a recount possible in a tight race for the Iowa 2nd District congressional seat being vacated by retiring seven-term Democrat Dave Loebsack. With all precincts reporting, Miller-Meeks held a razor-thin 282 vote lead over Democrat Rita Hart out of the nearly 394,000 votes cast in the race. Early voting and a large margin in heavily Democratic Johnson County with nearly 70 percent of the vote gave Hart, a former Democratic state senator from Wheatland, an early lead in the 24-county district that includes Scott, Muscatine, Clinton and Louisa counties. But Miller-Meeks pulled ahead late Tuesday night, leading with 49.95% of the votes cast to Hart's 49.87%, according to unofficial results. The Associated Press had yet to call the race. Hart had led Miller-Meeks with 109,763 votes to Miller-Meeks' 91,068 votes, with 13 of the district's 24 counties counted as of 10:43 p.m.” [Quad-City Times, 11/4/20]

November 2020: Following Election Day, The Contest For Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District Was In Statistical Dead Heat And Remained Undeclared As Absentee Ballots Were Being Received. “The victor in a very tight race in Iowa’s Second Congressional District still hasn’t been called. As of 5:00 a.m. Wednesday, with all 24 counties reporting, it’s a statistical dead heat between Republican Mariannette Miller-Meeks and Democrat Rita Hart. It was an even split, percentage-wise between the two, with each taking 50% of the vote but Miller-Meeks currently has the advantage in the vote count with 282 more than Hart. The unofficial vote total from the Iowa Secretary of State’s website does not take into account all mail-in votes and those can still be counted up until next week. As long as the votes were postmarked by midnight on Nov. 2nd and are received by noon on Nov. 9th, they can still be counted.” [WHO Des Moines, 11/4/20]

November 2020: Countywide Recounts And Precinct Audits Were Conducted At The Request Of Hart Following Miller-Meeks’ Apparent One-Ten-Thousandth Of A Point Lead

November 2020: Countywide Recounts And Precinct Audits Were Conducted At The Request Of Hart Following Miller-Meeks’ Apparent One-Ten-Thousandth Of A Point Lead. “Each county will assemble a three-person recount board, with each campaign appointing one individual and then mutually agreeing on the third. Boards will then recount ballots, going precinct by precinct to tabulate each vote again. It’s up to the recount board to decide whether to do a machine or hand recount. Only the U.S. House second district race will be recounted. There were 394,383 votes cast in the election. Miller-Meeks has a one-tenthousandth of a point lead. Given the tight margin, Iowa Secretary of State Paul Pate told the Quad-City Times on Tuesday there is the potential the result could change enough to impact the race. […] Errors discovered in Jasper County and Lucas County in the days after election night led changed votes, and leaders. Auditors in both counties said human data-entry errors were to blame. Countywide recounts and precinct audits were ordered in both counties. Jasper and Lucas will have to recount votes again to comply with the Hart campaign request.” [Ottumwa Courier, 11/18/20]
November 2020: McCarthy Claimed On Fox News That 300 Iowans Had Re-Voted, A Claim That PolitiFact Found “Pants On Fire” False

PolitiFact: McCarthy’s Claim That 300 Iowans Re-Voted, Costing Miller-Meeks Her Lead, Was “Pants On Fire” False. “Kevin McCarthy: In Iowa, ‘they have allowed a little over 300 people to re-vote.’ PolitiFact’s ruling: Pants on Fire Here’s why: House Minority Leader Kevin McCarthy, R-California, was talking on conservative commentator Laura Ingraham’s Fox News Channel show, The Ingraham Angle, on Nov. 5 about Republican claims of possible voter fraud when he referred to Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District race. Democratic Party candidate Rita Hart and Republican Party candidate Mariannette Miller-Meeks were in a tight battle for the seat. ‘I don’t have all the facts but I (sic) was just reported that they have allowed a little over 300 people to re-vote and now we’re behind,’ McCarthy said. […] McCarthy said that 300 voters in Iowa were allowed to re-vote to change an election outcome. That is wrong. Pate and Parrott laid out in their news conference how the state first reported votes in Miller-Meeks’ favor swung to being in Hart’s favor. No one was allowed to re-vote, Pate’s office said. And even though McCarthy couched his televised statement by saying he didn’t know all the facts, he said it anyway, and Ingraham picked up on it as though it were fact. We rate the claim of 300 Iowans allowed to re-vote as Pants on Fire.” [PolitiFact Texas, Austin American-Statesman, 11/20/20]

November 2020: A State Election Board Certified Miller-Meeks’ Victory By Six Votes

Miller-Meeks’ Victory By Six Votes Was Certified By A State Board In Late November 2020. “A state board certified Iowa Republican Mariannette Miller-Meeks as the representative-elect for Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District Monday in a race that came down to just six votes — the closest federal election in the country this year. Though Democrat Rita Hart is likely to challenge the results in court, the action marks the end of weeks of recounts that showed a steadily narrowing race. Shortly after Monday's board vote, Miller-Meeks thanked her supporters. ‘I will never quit fighting for you and your opportunity at the American Dream!’ she tweeted. ‘Let’s get to work!’ The state Board of Canvass met Monday afternoon in a brief teleconference to certify the results: 196,964 votes for Miller-Meeks to the 196,958 votes cast for Hart.” [Des Moines Register, 11/30/20]

December 2020: Miller-Meeks Told A Local Paper That Every Legal Ballot In Her Race Had Been Counted, But Told An Iowa PBS Affiliate That There Were Votes For Her That Had Not Been Counted

Miller-Meeks Told The Iowa City Press-Citizen That Every Legal Ballot In Her Race Had Been Counted, But Told An Iowa PBS Affiliate Some Votes For Her Were Not Counted. “Miller-Meeks repeatedly told the Press-Citizen in an interview last week that ‘every legal ballot (in the 2nd District race) was counted’ and that Hart was attempting to use a ‘partisan political process’ to change the election's result. But Miller-Meeks also acknowledged in an interview on PBS' Iowa Press over the weekend that ‘there were votes that were cast that were for me also that were not counted and that I did not receive.’” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 12/16/20]

December 2020: Following What She Called A “Haphazard” State-Led Recount, Hart Filed An Electoral Challenge In The House Of Representatives

December 2020: Rita Hart Filed An Electoral Challenge In The US House Under The Federal Contested Election Act Following What She Called A “Haphazard” Iowa Recount. “Miller-Meeks defeated Hart by just six votes after a bipartisan state canvassing board certified the election results following a district-wide recount in all 24 counties. Hart contends 22 ballots were unlawfully excluded from the certified election results. Hart and her attorneys, too, argue thousands of ballots with recorded under and over votes were not examined for voter intent, due to a ‘haphazard’ recount that was marred by errors, discrepancies and inconsistencies in how ballots were reviewed from county to county. Hart formally filed her challenge with the U.S. House on Dec. 22 under the Federal Contested Election Act. ‘As this provisional seating makes clear, we will not know who won this race until all votes have been counted,’ Hart said in a statement Sunday. ‘It is most important that we get this right and that the candidate who has received the most votes is seated.’” [Quad-City Times, 1/3/21]
• January 2021: Miller-Meeks Said “I Will Not Let Partisan Gamesmanship Stand In My Way To Deliver Results For The People Of Iowa. Now Is The Time To Put The 2020 Election Behind Us.” Allowing Miller-Meeks to take office does not preclude the House from potentially overturning the state's certified election results and later seating Hart pending the outcome of a House review of her election challenge. ‘To those whose support I have yet to earn, I will listen to you, I will fight for you, and I will work to be your representative too,’ Miller-Meeks said in a statement Sunday. ‘I will not let partisan gamesmanship stand in my way to deliver results for the people of Iowa,’ she said. ‘Now is the time to put the 2020 election behind us, unite our country, and work together to tackle the pressing issues that face our country.’” [Quad-City Times, 1/3/21]

January 2021: Pelosi Seated Miller-Meeks Provisionally

January 2021: Speaker Nancy Pelosi Provisionally Seated And Swore In Miller-Meeks Alongside Other Freshmen Despite Any House Member Having The Right To Object To Her Swearing In. “Former Iowa state senator and Ottumwa Republican Mariannette Miller-Meeks, who unveiled a new congressional Twitter account, joined a record number of House GOP women who were sworn in Sunday with the new 117th Congress. A record number of women and racial minorities make the 117th Congress the most diverse in history, including a majority female Iowa congressional delegation. ‘It’s a real honor to be among this class of incoming members, and not solely because of their diversity or solely because they’re women, but when you look at the women (on both sides of the aisle) ... you look at their resumes and these are people that are talented,’ Miller-Meeks told the Quad-City Times ahead of being provisionally sworn in to represents southeast Iowa's 2nd Congressional District. Any member of the House could have objected to Miller-Meeks being sworn in with the rest of the freshmen class. However, House Speak Nancy Pelosi, D-Calif., last week announced she would provisionally seat Miller-Meeks while Democrat Rita Hart of Wheatland continues to contest the election results.” [Quad-City Times, 1/3/21]

January 2021: Miller-Meeks Said Her Transition Team Had Been Slow In Setting Up District Offices And Hiring Staff In Light Of Her Being Seated Provisionally. “While being provisionally sworn in, Miller-Meeks said she will be ‘a fully functioning member of Congress, with all the same rights and privileges’ of any other House member, including voting privileges and being assigned to House committees. Miller-Meeks said her transition team has been slow in setting up district offices and hiring staff, given the haze of uncertainty that surrounds the outcome of the race. ‘We're trying to be very respectful of people and making them aware of the situation that we are in,’ but has said she remains hopeful ‘things will go very smoothly’ to avoid interruption or disruption in constituent services and ‘residual casework.’” [Quad-City Times, 1/3/21]

March 2021: Rita Hart Withdrew Her Election Challenge And Acknowledged Miller-Meeks’ Victory, After Facing Backlash For A Contentious Case Based On 22 Ballots That Were Allegedly Wrongfully Uncounted

March 2021: Rita Hart Withdrew Her Election Challenge And Acknowledged Miller-Meeks’ Victory. “Rita Hart, the Iowa Democrat who lost a House race by just six votes, is withdrawing her challenge to Republican Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks. In a statement posted to Twitter on Wednesday, the former state senator said she made the decision ‘after many conversations with people I trust about the future of this contest.’ ‘I wish Mariannette Miller-Meeks all the best as she serves the people of this great state as Congresswoman,’ she said. ‘This has been a difficult process for all of those involved and it’s incredibly important that we work together to reform the system so this does not happen again in the future.’” [NPR, 3/31/21]

• March 2021: Miller-Meeks Said Hart “Did The Right Thing” In Conceding Rather Than “Drag The Whole Country Through Another Contentious Process.” “Miller-Meeks, in statement, thanked Hart for ending the challenge. ‘I know how extremely difficult it is to lose an election, but for the people to have faith and confidence in the election system and Iowa laws, it was gracious of her to concede at this time,’ said Miller-Meeks, who has been serving provisionally in the House while the contest continued. ‘I look forward to continuing to work to represent the people of Iowa's Second District.’ Miller-Meeks called the end of the
contest ‘a tremendous relief’ as she arrived at a vaccination clinic at the Washington County Department of Public Health. She said Hart ‘did the right thing’ rather than ‘drag the whole country through another contentious process.’” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 3/31/21]

- **New York Times:** “Hart’s Campaign Had Identified 22 Ballots That They Believed Were Legally Cast But ‘Wrongfully’ Uncounted By State Election Officials.” “Ms. Hart’s campaign had identified 22 ballots that they believed were legally cast but ‘wrongfully’ uncounted by state election officials during a districtwide recount in the fall. Rather than taking her case to court in Iowa before the election was certified, Ms. Hart opted to wait and appeal the results to the House Administration Committee, invoking a 1960s law. With Democrats in control of the chamber, they would have run the review and had the power to order their own recount and a vote by the full House on whether to unseat Ms. Miller-Meeks in favor of their own candidate, which would have added to their eight-seat majority.” [New York Times, 3/31/21]

CNN: “Miller-Meeks’ Lawyers Warned Monday That Hart's Case Could Damage The Public's Faith In Its Elections.” ‘Miller-Meeks' lawyers warned Monday that Hart's case could damage the public's faith in its elections if a Democratic-controlled House Administration Committee investigated her case, and a Democratic-controlled House voted to seat a Democrat despite the verdict of the state's election board. They asked in the brief, ‘At what point would the committee be merely searching for a result rather than searching for the will of Iowans?’” [CNN, 3/29/21]

| June 2021: Miller-Meeks Claimed Democrats Had Engaged In Disinformation In What She Called A “Brazen Attempt To Overturn A State-Certified Election” |

Miller-Meeks Said Democrats Engaged In A “Disinformation Campaign” And “Misinformation Campaign” During The 2020 Recount In Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District. “With the Senate poised to vote this week on S. 1, their version of House Speaker Nancy Pelosi’s election takeover bill, I am reminded of how the Democrats did everything they could to cast doubt on my own hard-fought election victory and how S. 1 is their effort to take their disinformation campaign about Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District election to the national stage. For those who did not closely follow that 2020 election saga, the most important thing to know is it took my Democratic opponent and Democratic Party leaders like Speaker Pelosi nearly five months to accept that a slim majority of voters in Iowa’s 2nd District duly elected me as their legitimate representative. But by the time they admitted the obvious, the damage of their misinformation campaign was already done.” [Fox News, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks Op-Ed, 6/22/21]


Miller-Meeks Op-Ed: Democrats “Did Everything They Could To Cast Doubt On My Own Hard-Fought Election Victory” In A “Brazen Attempt To Overturn A State-Certified Election.” “With the Senate poised to vote this week on S. 1, their version of House Speaker Nancy Pelosi’s election takeover bill, I am reminded of how the Democrats did everything they could to cast doubt on my own hard-fought election victory and how S. 1 is their effort to take their disinformation campaign about Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District election to the national stage. […] But for Pelosi and her fellow Democrats, their brazen attempt to overturn a state-certified election was always about furthering their ultimate goal—rewriting election laws to guarantee the outcome in their favor forever.” [Fox News, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks Op-Ed, 6/22/21]

| June 2021: Miller-Meeks Claimed She “Got Elected By More Than Six Votes” But “Six Is What They Cheated Me Down To” |

Miller-Meeks Claimed She “Got Elected By More Than Six Votes” But “Six Is What They Cheated Me Down To.” “Haley headlined a fundraiser Saturday at Crow Valley Golf Club in Davenport for Miller-Meeks, who won last year’s election for Iowa’s 2nd district U.S. House seat by six votes, the narrowest victory margin in a House race in almost 40 years, after Democrat Rita Hart ended her 2020 election challenge before the U.S. House in March. ‘I like to say I got elected by more than six votes. Six is what they cheated me down to,’ Miller-Meeks told the crowd of roughly 90 supporters.” [Quad-City Times, 6/26/21]
July 2021: Miller-Meeks Said She Did Not Think There Was Fraud In Her 2020 Election After Previously Saying She Was “Cheated Down” To A Six-Vote Margin. “Miller-Meeks won her race for Iowa’s second district congressional seat by just six votes. In late June told a crowd in Davenport she had been ‘cheated down’ to that margin in the district-wide recount. Last night, Miller-Meeks took issue with how some county auditors handled tabulation errors, but she said Iowans can trust the final certified result. ‘I don’t think that there was fraud in this election,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘I think that Iowans can be confident of election integrity and they can be confident of the process.’” [Radio Iowa, 7/9/21]

2020 Campaign

September 2020: Women Vote! Ran An Ad Claiming “Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Who Took Thousands From Big Insurance, Supported A Plan That Could Cost 187,000 Iowans Their Coverage Or Let Insurers Deny It Because Of Preexisting Conditions, Like Diabetes.” “One of those ads is by Women Vote!, a Super PAC of Emily's List, a network formed in 1985 with the goal of electing more pro-abortion rights Democratic women to office. The 30-second ad starts by mentioning COVID-19 and showing images of damage from the Aug. 10 derecho. 'During a pandemic, in the wake of a disaster, losing your health insurance would be devastating,' the voice says. The ad claims 'Mariannette Miller-Meeks, who took thousands from big insurance, supported a plan that could cost 187,000 Iowans their coverage or let insurers deny it because of preexisting conditions, like diabetes.’” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 9/28/20]

A Fact-Check By The Cedar Rapids Gazette Gave The Women Vote! Ad A “B” Grade Overall. “The attacks in this ad against Mariannette Miller-Meeks are similar to those against other Republicans in congressional races across the country. PolitiFact scored a nearly identical ad ‘true’ in the 7th District contest in Virginia. That ad says Republican challenger Nick Frietas ‘supports a plan letting insurance companies deny coverage for preexisting conditions like asthma or diabetes.’ While Miller-Meeks hasn't served in Congress and hasn't had a chance to vote on a repeal of the Affordable Care Act, she has been vocal about wanting to get rid of it. If Women Vote! had stopped after the first three claims, the group would have gotten an A overall. But the fourth claim, which got a D, sinks the check to a B.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 9/28/20]

Quad City Times: “List Of 20 Republicans Who Have Thrown Their Support Behind Hart Instead Of Republican Nominee Mariannette Miller-Meeks.” “Just one day after securing the Democratic nomination for Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District, Rita Hart has earned endorsements from several Republican officials. The Rita Hart for Iowa campaign has announced ‘Republicans for Rita’, a list of 20 Republicans who have thrown their support behind Hart instead of Republican nominee Mariannette Miller-Meeks leading into the Nov. 3 general election.” [Quad City Times, 6/3/20]

Primary

June 2020: Miller-Meeks Won The Republican Primary In Iowa’s 2nd District With 48% Of The Vote. “State Sen. Mariannette Miller-Meeks won the Republican nomination for Iowa's 2nd Congressional District on Tuesday night. In November, she will face Democrat Rita Hart in the general election. Miller Meeks, of Ottumwa, received 48% of the vote. In the primary, she faced Bobby Schilling of Le Claire, who received 36% of the vote; Steven Everly of Knoxville, who received 6%; and Rick Phillips of Pella and and Tim Borchardt of Iowa City both received about 5%.” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 6/3/20]

Iowa City Press-Citizen: The 2020 Republican Primary In Iowa’s 2nd District Was A Fight “Over Who The Most Anti-Abortion Candidate Was And Who The Bigger Supporter Of President Donald Trump Was.” “The Republican primary was marked by a back-and-forth volley, as Miller-Meeks and Schilling fought over who the most anti-abortion candidate was and who the bigger supporter of President Donald Trump was. In a news conference before the results were counted, Miller-Meeks said that although it was a tough primary, it made her ‘battle-tested.’” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 6/3/20]
Iowa City Press-Citizen: Miller-Meeks Primary Opponent Painted Her As A “Pro-Abortion Fraudster” Which She Denied. “In this primary, Schilling has been painting Miller-Meeks as a pro-abortion fraudster, a claim she denies. Miller-Meeks has been painting Schilling as a vote-hungry carpetbagger from Illinois, a claim he denies. Both camps are unwilling to buy the other’s denial. With the clock running out on the 2020 primary, Terry Schilling’s offer was met with skepticism from the Miller-Meeks campaign. […] It was Schilling’s campaign who leaked a 2018 video of Miller-Meeks saying she is pro-choice, a moment Woolson has explained as a misstatement.” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 5/23/20]

Oct. 2019: Miller-Meeks Announced She Was Running For Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District. “Voters are feeling ‘tremendous angst’ while waiting for Congress to get to work on health care, trade and other issues that impact them, according to state Sen. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, who is kicking off her campaign for the U.S. House from Iowa’s 2nd District. ‘People are looking for answers,’ Miller-Meeks said in explaining why she’s seeking the Republican nomination in the 24-county southeast Iowa district that includes Johnson County.” [The Gazette, 10/1/19]

### 2018 State Senate Campaign

**Miller-Meeks Ran For Iowa State Senate To Fill The Seat Of A Retiring Sen. Mark Chelgren.** “A four-way race has taken shape for the Iowa Senate seat held by retiring Sen. Mark Chelgren. Both parties will have primaries. On the Republican side, Daniel Cesar and Mariannette Miller-Meeks are facing off. Miller-Meeks is known in the district, having previously run for Congress, and was the head of the Iowa Department of Public Health.” [Ad Express & Daily Iowegian, 3/16/18]

**Miller-Meeks Ran Against Democrat Mary Stewart.** “Senate District 41: This southeast Iowa seat is being vacated by Chelgren, which has set up a contest between Republican Mariannette Miller-Meeks and Democrat Mary Stewart, both of Ottumwa. Miller-Meeks, an ophthalmologist and former state health director, has lost three previous campaigns for Congress, but GOP officials say they are optimistic about her Senate candidacy. Stewart is a former community college administrator with more than 30 years’ experience in job training and economic development. The district has 13,542 Democrats, 10,645 Republicans, and 11,175 other voters.” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 10/9/18]

### 2014 Congressional Campaign

**Feb. 2014: Miller-Meeks Resigned As Director Of The Iowa Department Of Public Health And Then Announced Run For Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District.** “Miller-Meeks resigned as director of the Iowa Department of Public Health And Then Announced Run For Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District. “When Dr. Mariannette Miller-Meeks announced her resignation as director of the Iowa Department of Public Health, many speculated it was the first step in a run for Congress. Miller-Meeks announced Sunday evening she would seek the Republican nomination in Iowa’s Second Congressional District in June. Campaign spokesman Eric Woolson said Miller-Meeks will kick off her campaign with a tour of cities in the district later this week.” [The Newton Daily News, 2/24/14]

**Miller-Meeks Called For Seven Debates With Congressman Loebsack.** “The Republican challenger in Iowa’s U.S. House 2nd District is challenging the incumbent to a series of debates to give everyone ‘an opportunity to observe the differences between us.’ In a letter to Democratic Rep. Dave Loebsack of Iowa City, Mariannette Miller-Meeks of Ottumwa called for seven debates between now and October throughout the 24-county district, which includes all of southeast Iowa.” [The Hawk Eye, 7/3/14]

**Loebsack Said Three Debates Were Enough.** “The candidates’ campaigns have sparred over debates for several weeks, with Loebsack saying that three debates are sufficient and Miller-Meeks pushing for more debates spread throughout the 2nd District. ‘There is no doubt that there are stark differences between Dave Loebsack and Dr. Miller-Meeks, which is why the people of Iowa’s Second District deserve the opportunity to
see them side-by-side,’ Jennie Johnson, Loebsack’s campaign manager, said in a news release. ‘That’s why we’ve accepted the invitations to three debates, which is the same number of debates that Dr. Miller-Meeks’ former boss, Gov. Branstad, has agreed to participate in.’” [The Quad-City Times, 8/19/14]

**Miller-Meeks Brought Up Her Ties With Iowa Gov. Terry Branstad Who Republicans Credited For Overseeing The State’s Recession Recovery.** “Miller-Meeks said Americans have lost faith in the government, but brought up her ties with Iowa Gov. Terry Branstad — someone Republicans have repeatedly credited for overseeing the state’s recession recovery. She would encourage schools across the state to work more with the business sector, and encouraged degree-seekers to consider community college education as a route to skilled work employment available in Iowa.” [Clinton Herald, 10/11/14]

**Endorsing Loebsack’s Re-Election, Des Moines Register Editorial Board Said Miller-Meeks’ Positions Are Vague, And She Hedges On A Number Of Key Issues.** “Miller-Meeks, however, has not made a persuasive case for why voters should remove the incumbent. Her policy positions are vague, and she hedges on a number of key issues, including offering no specifics on how to assure both Social Security and Medicare will be solvent for future retirees. She supports more spending for roads and bridges, but she says she needs more information on options for how to pay for such improvements. She also wants to see more study on climate change causes and solutions.” [Des Moines Register, Editorial Board, 10/22/14]

### 2010 Congressional Campaign

**Dec. 2009: Miller-Meeks Announced Run For Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District.** “In announcing her second bid for the 2nd District congressional seat, Republican Mariannette Miller-Meeks is running on the rich history of the GOP in the hopes of making history herself. ‘This is old fashioned politics,’ Miller-Meeks said standing on a soapbox crafted by Sen. James Hahn, R-Muscatine and dotted with signatures of people she visited on her campaign. Although she joked that the soapbox gave her the only opportunity to claim to be taller than anyone, the petite Miller-Meeks is serious about her message.” [The Hawk Eye, 12/1/09]

**Miller-Meeks’ Husband Lost His Job After She Won The Primary And She Considered Dropping Out Of The Race.** “Republican Mariannette Miller-Meeks seriously considered dropping out of the race for U.S. House when her husband lost his job in July and the couple’s income plunged to zero. ‘I was crushed. I mean, I was devastated when he told me,’ she said Tuesday in an interview. ‘It was everything I could do not to cry and to keep it together.’ For 2½ weeks, she agonized over whether she should return to her ophthalmology practice or take a part-time job to cover family expenses, such as the mortgage on their $563,000 rural Ottumwa home. Miller-Meeks said she told no one about her dilemma, not even Republican Party officials. Few people knew what Miller-Meeks went through until she answered questions about her health insurance coverage – she has none – during a meeting with Register editors and reporters.” [Des Moines Register, 9/8/10]

**Miller-Meeks Decided To Keep Running For Congress Even Though It wasn’t Too Late For The Republican Party To Pick A Replacement Candidate.** “When she received the news about her husband’s job loss, it wasn’t too late for the Republican Party to pick a replacement candidate to challenge Democrat Dave Loebsack, a former college professor from Mount Vernon. The deadline to name substitutions was Aug. 13, state election officials said. But Miller-Meeks decided not to back out of her rematch against Loebsack, even though she lost 57 percent to 39 percent in 2008 and now faces an uphill battle in a Democratic-leaning district.” [Des Moines Register, 9/8/10]

**Miller-Meeks Refused To Be On Her Husband’s Insurance Plan Saying “I’m A Very Healthy Person, And What I’ve Done Is Look At My Family History And Determine What My Level Of Risk Is.”** “Republican Mariannette Miller-Meeks seriously considered dropping out of the race for U.S. House when her husband lost his job […] One consequence of her husband’s job loss involved health insurance. […] Even though her husband’s new job offers insurance, Miller-Meeks, 55, said she does not want to be on his insurance plan. ‘I’m a very healthy person, and what I’ve done is look at my family history and determine what my level of risk is,’ she said. ‘Am I saying it’s a smart thing to do? No. I think we need to make health insurance more affordable.’” [Des Moines Register, 9/8/10]
Miller-Meeks Won A Four-Way Primary, Winning More Than Half The Votes Cast In The 2nd District Republican Primary. “Mariannette Miller-Meeks won a spirited four-way primary to set up a rematch against Democratic U.S. Rep. Dave Loebsack, winning more than half the votes cast in the 2nd District Republican primary June 8. With 100 percent of the 328 precincts reporting, the Ottumwa ophthalmologist had received 51 percent of the vote compared with 22 percent for Steve Rathe of Cedar Rapids and 15 percent for Christopher Reed and 13 percent for Rob Gettemy, both of Marion. The Associated Press called the race for Miller-Meeks just before 10 p.m.” [Globe Gazette, 6/9/10]

Ottumwa Courier: “Miller-Meeks Has Shed Her Moderate Views” That Won Her The Courier Endorsement In 2008. “Miller-Meeks is from Ottumwa, and swayed by her local roots and moderate views, this newspaper endorsed her initial run for the 2nd Congressional seat two years ago. […] This year’s political partisanship has ratcheted up the campaign vehemence with terms such as ‘fired’ and ‘eliminated’ when the subject is incumbents, and Miller-Meeks has shed her moderate views to match the times. She has made much of her refusal to buy medical insurance. She has voiced support for the ‘fair tax’ that even her own party’s experts acknowledge would be anything but fair to middle class Americans. But in all that politicking one thing stands out in her campaign. Back in the earliest days of this race, she said if she lost this time she’d move to the East Coast.” [The Ottumwa Courier, Editorial Board, 10/21/10]

2010: Miller-Meeks Lost To Loebsack For A Second Time. “Democratic Rep. David Loebsack has won a third term in Congress, surviving a determined challenge by Republican Mariannette Miller-Meeks in a rematch of a race two years ago. Loebsack was first elected in 2006 in a surprise win over veteran Republican Rep. Jim Leach. In 2008, Loebsack cruised to a win over Miller-Meeks. The race seemed more competitive this time, as Miller-Meeks campaigned extensively and focused on a message of reducing the deficit and cutting spending.” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 11/2/10]

Miller-Meeks Said She’s “Never Seen Tea Party People Who Are Inflammatory, Racist Or Bigoted” Despite North Iowa Tea Party’s Billboard That Depicted Pres. Obama Surrounded By Adolf Hitler And Vladimir Lenin. “Despite the flap over the North Iowa Tea Party’s short-lived billboard in Mason City that depicted Pres. Obama surrounded by dictators Adolf Hitler and Vladimir Lenin, Miller-Meeks said she’s ‘never seen tea party people who are inflammatory, racist or bigoted. The tea party is holding people responsible and getting our nation back to the Constitution and the rule of law.’” [Muscatine Journal, 7/19/10]

2008 Congressional Campaign

October 2007: Miller-Meeks Announced Run For Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District, Stating Her Interest Stemmed From Concern About The Nation’s Health Care System. “Dr. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, who was the first woman to serve as president of the Iowa Medical Society, said her interest in a 2nd District campaign stemmed from concern about the nation’s health care system. ‘There certainly is a lot of frustration by physicians on what’s happening with health care, Medicare reimbursement, the inability to recruit doctors to a small state, especially a rural state,’ she said. More physicians need to be involved in increasing access to health care, she said.” [Des Moines Register, 10/18/07]

Miller-Meeks Had Been Registered As A No-Party Voter And Had Not Been Involved In Politics Prior To Announcing Her 2008 Run. “Miller-Meeks, 52, said she has been registered as a no-party voter and has not been involved in politics. ‘It’s a new kind of endeavor, one born out of frustration neither party is getting the job done,’ she said. She said her family moved around because of her father’s Air Force career, though they kept a home in Texas. She began her career as a nurse, then took medical courses while serving in the Army and graduated from medical school at the University of Texas.” [Des Moines Register, 10/18/07]

Miller-Meeks Used An Ambulance As A Campaign Prop. “The other woman running for Congress is Republican Mariannette Miller-Meeks, an Ottumwa ophthalmologist. She’s challenging Loebsack in the congressional district arguably hardest-hit by the floods this year. Miller-Meeks, who has an ambulance as a
campaign prop, is tapping into a network of physicians for contributions, mostly in Iowa so far, but she will need more with just $5,200 cash on hand.” [Des Moines Register, 7/20/08]

**Miller-Meeks Lost The Election Trying To Unseat Representative Dave Loebshack.** “Dr. Mariannette Miller-Meeks more than held her own as a Republican in Wapello County, the heavily Democratic county she calls home It wasn’t enough to unseat Dave Loebshack, the first-term Democratic representative from Iowa’s Second Congressional district.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 11/4/08]

---

**Personal Political Donations**

### Miller-Meeks Has Given $45,824 To Federal Political Candidates

According to the Federal Election Commission, Miller-Meeks has given $45,824 to federal political candidates and committees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Candidate (Office Sought) or Committee</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/9/21</td>
<td>Value In Electing Women PAC</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/10/21</td>
<td>Julia Letlow for Congress</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/12/21</td>
<td>Esther for Congress (Esther Joy King)</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$2,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/27/20</td>
<td>Feenstra for Congress</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/15/20</td>
<td>Clifford for Congress</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/24/20</td>
<td>Maggie’s List</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/31/19</td>
<td>Clifford for Congress</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/7/19</td>
<td>Ashley Hinson for Congress</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/31/19</td>
<td>Clifford for Congress</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2018</td>
<td>American Academy of Ophthalmology Inc Political Committee (OPHTHPAC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>American Future Fund Political Action</td>
<td></td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2018</td>
<td>American Medical Association Political Action Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>Ganske For Senate</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2019</td>
<td>Iowa Medical Political Action Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2020</td>
<td>Iowa Medical Society Political Action Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Iowans For Jim Leach</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$1,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>John McCain 2008 Inc.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>King For Congress</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Latham For Congress</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>McCain Victory 2008</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2014</td>
<td>Miller-Meeks For Congress</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$3,167.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>National Republican Congressional Committee Contributions</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>People For Ganske</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Price For Congress</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Redwine Congressional Committee</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2018</td>
<td>Republican National Committee</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$1,430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Miller-Meeks Has Given $29,738 To State-Level Political Candidates

According to Iowa Secretary of State, Miller-Meeks has given $29,738 to state-level candidates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Candidate (Office Sought) or Committee</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-2008</td>
<td>Iowa Ophthalmology P.A.C.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/31/19</td>
<td>Citizens for Holly Brink</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/2/20</td>
<td>Team Lofgren</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/17/20</td>
<td>Sinclair for Iowa</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/31/19</td>
<td>Hite for State House</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/12/19</td>
<td>Jeff Shipley’s Committee for Peace and Prosperity</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Cournoyer for Senate</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/3/19</td>
<td>Friends of Joma Short</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/3/19</td>
<td>Koelker for Iowa Senate</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/3/19</td>
<td>Schneider for State Senate</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/18/19</td>
<td>Westrich for Iowa</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/19</td>
<td>Dan Zumbach for Senate</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/26/19</td>
<td>Friends of Jon Dunwell</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Jennifer Smith for Iowa</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Kim Reynolds for Iowa</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Des Moines County Republican Central Committee</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/28/19</td>
<td>Taxpayers for Mitchell</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/28/19</td>
<td>David Kerr State House</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/31/10</td>
<td>Team Lofgren</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/07</td>
<td>Glenn Nitzsche For Supervisor</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Jared Klein For Iowa House District 089 (Klein For Statehouse)</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/09</td>
<td>Waukee For McGee</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>Washington County Republican Central Committee</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2019</td>
<td>Johnson County Republican Central Committee</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$458.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Citizens For Richards</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>Sands For State House</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Marshan Roth Campaign Fund</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/16/13</td>
<td>John Ethredge For Supervisor</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/28/13</td>
<td>Chelgren For Iowa Senate</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Friends Of Whitver</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Political Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/30/13</td>
<td>Sheets For Iowa House</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Neff For County Attorney</td>
<td>$315</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2020</td>
<td>Iowa Medical Political Action Committee</td>
<td>$4,927</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/1/12</td>
<td>Elect Nealson</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Smith For Iowa House</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/7/13</td>
<td>Kaufman For State House</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/12/14</td>
<td>Shipley For Iowa</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/18/14</td>
<td>Brain Schmidt For State Senate</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Westrich For Iowa</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Friends For Miller-Meeks</td>
<td>$7,058.85</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2016</td>
<td>Governor Branstad Committee</td>
<td>$680</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2018</td>
<td>Mosiman For State Auditor</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/1/18</td>
<td>Pate For Iowa</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Adam Gregg For Iowa</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Davis For State Treasurer</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Committee To Elect Jim Hahn</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2019</td>
<td>Appanoose County Republican Central Committee</td>
<td>$140</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2019</td>
<td>Cedar County Republican Central Committee</td>
<td>$520</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2019</td>
<td>Clinton County Republican Central Committee</td>
<td>$210</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2019</td>
<td>Jasper County Republican Central Committee</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2019</td>
<td>Keokuk County Republican Central Committee</td>
<td>$550</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2019</td>
<td>Lee County Republican Central Committee</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Linn County Republican Central Committee</td>
<td>$210</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2019</td>
<td>Marion County Republican Central Committee</td>
<td>$145</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Polk County Republican Central Committee</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/1/09</td>
<td>Republican Party Of Iowa</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2019</td>
<td>Scott County Republican Central Committee</td>
<td>$145</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2020</td>
<td>Wapello County Republican Central Committee</td>
<td>$4,170</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Scott County Republican Women</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Team Iowa PAC</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>Purse PAC</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Susan Mosier For Kansas State House</td>
<td>$342</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Thomas Price For Georgia State House</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total      | $29,738 | |

Miller-Meeks Has Given $840,829 In Loans To Her Own Campaigns

According to the Federal Election Commission and Iowa Secretary of State, Miller-Meeks has loaned $840,829.61 to her own political committees.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Candidate (Office Sought) or Committee</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Miller-Meeks For Congress</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Miller-Meeks For Congress</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$593,670.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Miller-Meeks For Congress</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$25,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Friends For Miller-Meeks (State Senate)</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$7058.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Miller-Meeks for Congress</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$195,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$840,829.61</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[FEC, Campaign Committee, accessed 2/21/22; Iowa Secretary of State, accessed 7/19/19; Follow The Money, accessed 7/19/19]
## Significant Findings

- **2009-2021:** Miller-Meeks’ reported net worth fluctuated between $0 and $386,049-$2,414,999, with both values being reported in personal financial disclosures filed in 2021.

- **2009-2022:** Miller-Meeks loaned $833,770.76 to her own campaigns.

- **2020:** Miller-Meeks loaned $195,000 to her own campaign while reporting a net worth between $201,003 and $515,000.

- **2010:** Miller-Meeks loaned more than $590,000 to her own campaign shortly after reporting a net worth between $276,268 and $1,342,000.

- Miller-Meeks appeared to hide hundreds of thousands of dollars in assets and income on her 2020 personal financial disclosure.
  - **2019:** Miller-Meeks reported owning between $202,002 and $515,000 in assets in three accounts.
    - Miller-Meeks’ Voya Financial account appeared to be coded or described incorrectly.
  - **2020:** Miller-Meeks did not disclose any assets and failed to report her state Senate income
    - Miller-Meeks failed to disclose her $25,000 annual salary from serving in the state Senate in 2020.
    - Miller-Meeks claimed to have divested of her assets before joining Congress, but she was still required to report them in her financial disclosure because the filing covered calendar year 2020.
    - Miller-Meeks was required to report her bank accounts if they totaled more than $5,000 or if any account generated more than $200 in interest.

- Miller-Meeks failed to disclose her deferred compensation agreement with her previous employer.
  - **2020:** Miller-Meeks reported receiving at least $5,000 in deferred compensation from her previous employer, but her spokesperson said she did not receive any income from the organization.
    - Miller-Meeks improperly disclosed the income received through her deferred compensation agreement with Great River Health System.
  - Miller-Meeks failed to properly report her deferred compensation agreement on Schedule F of her personal financial disclosure.

- After her first personal financial disclosure filing raised questions from local reporters, Miller-Meeks lied about her assets and income.
Miller-Meeks’ spokesperson said she had no outside income, including IRAs or 401(k)s, that were required to be publicly disclosed, and claimed she had divested of her assets before joining Congress.

Miller-Meeks’ spokesperson: “I can confirm through the congresswoman that she does not have any outside income (IRAs /401ks)” and “she divested of those assets.”

Miller-Meeks and her husband actually had retirement accounts worth up to $1,360,000 and total assets worth up to $2,615,000.

Miller-Meeks reported an IRA withdrawal of $100,000 as income.

Miller-Meeks’ spokesperson said she did not receive any income from her previous employer in 2020, but she actually received more than $200,000.

Miller-Meeks’ spokesperson claimed she did not receive her pension in 2020, but she actually received nearly $5,000.

On her amended PFD, Miller-Meeks appeared to have violated the House Ethics cap on outside income and failed to properly report her deferred compensation agreement with her previous employer.

Miller-Meeks appeared to receive more than $31,000 in qualified outside income in 2021, which would violate a House Ethics rule prohibiting members from earning outside income above a set threshold.

Miller-Meeks again failed to properly report her deferred compensation and pension agreements with her previous employers on Schedule F of her personal financial disclosure.

2021: Miller-Meeks was fined $500 for twice violating COVID protocols by not wearing a mask on the house floor.

2009-2021: Miller-Meeks’ Reported Net Worth Repeatedly Fluctuated By Hundreds Of Thousands Of Dollars, Sometimes As Low As $0


2019: Miller-Meeks Reported An Estimated Net Worth Between $201,003 And $515,000. [Miller-Meeks 2019 Personal Financial Disclosure Report, filed 12/1/19]

2014: Miller-Meeks Reported An Estimated Net Worth Between $1,001 And $15,000. [Miller-Meeks 2014 Personal Financial Disclosure Report, filed 5/2/14]

2009-2022: Miller-Meeks Loaned $833,770.76 To Her Own Campaigns

2022: Over Her Five Runs For Congress, Miller-Meeks Had Loaned $833,770.76 To Her Own Congressional Campaigns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miller-Meeks Loans Made By Candidate</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Election Cycle</strong></td>
<td><strong>Election Type</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td>$833,770.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[FEC Committee Candidate and Committee Viewer, accessed 3/3/22]

2020: Miller-Meeks Loaned $195,000 To Her Own Campaign While Reporting A Net Worth Between $201,003 And $515,000

2020: Miller-Meeks Loaned $195,000 To Her Campaign. [FEC Committee Candidate and Committee Viewer, accessed 3/3/22]

- October 2020: Miller-Meeks Loaned $100,000 To Her Campaign. [FEC Committee Candidate and Committee Viewer, 10/26/20]

- March 2020: Miller-Meeks Loaned $95,000 To Her Campaign. [FEC Committee Candidate and Committee Viewer, 3/31/20]


2010: Miller-Meeks Loaned More Than $590,000 To Her Own Campaign Shortly After Reporting A Net Worth Between $276,268 And $1,342,000

2010: Miller-Meeks Loaned $593,670.76 To Her Campaign. [FEC Committee Candidate and Committee Viewer, accessed 3/3/22]


Miller-Meeks Appeared To Hide Hundreds Of Thousands Of Dollars In Assets And Income On Her 2020 Personal Financial Disclosure

2019: Miller-Meeks Reported Owning Between $202,002 And $515,000 In Assets In Three Accounts


- Miller-Meeks Reported A Vanguard Money Market Account As An IRA Held In Cash Valued At
$100,001-$250,000. [House Ethics Committee, Amended 2019 Personal Financial Disclosure: Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Filed 5/27/20]

- Miller-Meeks Reported A Vanguard Roth IRA As An IRA Held In Cash Valued At $1,001-$15,000. [House Ethics Committee, Amended 2019 Personal Financial Disclosure: Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Filed 5/27/20]


**Miller-Meeks’ Voya Financial Account Appeared To Be Coded Or Described Incorrectly**


**Stocks, Mutual Funds, And 401(k) Accounts Have Distinct Asset Type Codes For Financial Disclosure Reporting.** [United States House Of Representatives, Accessed 8/23/21]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2020: Miller-Meeks Did Not Disclose Any Assets And Failed To Report Her State Senate Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


| Cedar Rapids Gazette: In Her 2020 PFD, “Miller-Meeks Did Not List Her $25,000 Annual Salary From The Iowa Senate, Where She Served From January 2019 To January 2021.” “Miller-Meeks did not list her $25,000 annual salary from the Iowa Senate, where she served from January 2019 to January 2021. Will Kiley, a spokesman for Miller-Meeks, said Wednesday his boss now is working with the House to update her form to add her Iowa Senate salary. He said Miller-Meeks does not have any outside income, including from IRAs or 401(k)s, that she would be required to report on the form.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 9/17/21] |

| Ottumwa Courier: In Her 2020 Personal Financial Disclosure, Miller-Meeks “Did Not Disclose Any Salary As A Former State Senator, Which Carried A $25,000 Annual Salary.” “In her 2020 disclosure, Miller-Meeks reported $100,000 in salary from her time as a current representative, but did not disclose any salary as a former state senator, which carried a $25,000 annual salary.” [Ottumwa Courier, 9/17/21] |

| Miller-Meeks Claimed To Have Divested Of Her Assets Before Joining Congress, But She Was Still Required To Report Them In Her Financial Disclosure Because The Filing Covered Calendar Year 2020 |

| Miller-Meeks’ Spokesperson Said She “Does Not Have Any Outside Income” And “Divested Of [Her] Assets” Before Joining Congress. “I can confirm through the Congresswoman that she does not have any outside income (IRAs/401ks),” according to the spokesperson. “The Congresswoman said she divested of those assets (stocks, etc.) before she became a (House) Member. The income reported includes 2021 congressional pay, and the Congresswoman is already working with the House to ensure the filing is complete.”” [Quad-City Times, 9/15/21] |
The Only Income Miller-Meeks Reported Was Her 2021 Congressional Salary Despite The Fact That The Reporting Year For The Disclosure Form Was 2020, Not 2021. “Democrats are raising questions about Iowa freshman Republican U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks’ finances – or apparent lack thereof. Miller-Meeks’ personal financial disclosure form, which she filed with the Clerk of House on Aug. 13, is notably scarce. The only financial information listed on the form is Miller-Meeks’ $100,000 salary as a member of Congress (that despite the report intended to cover the previous full year’s finances for 2020; Miller-Meeks did not become a member of Congress until 2021) and a deferred compensation payout from Great River Health System in Burlington, where Miller-Meeks worked as an ophthalmologist before being elected to Congress. The report, which is required annually of all House members and congressional candidates, does not list the mount of the payout, only that the compensation exceeds $5,000.” [Quad-City Times, 9/15/21]

House Ethics Committee Guidelines Stated That The Reporting Period For New Members Was Calendar Year 2020. “New Members: New Members (i.e., those sworn in between November 4, 2020, and April 15, 2021) must file on or before May 17, 2021. New Members must complete Schedules A, C, D, E, F, and J in the online filing system or a paper Form B. […] The reporting period for New Members, as defined on page 2, is calendar year 2020.” [U.S. House Of Representative Committee On Ethics, Accessed 9/16/21]

House Ethics Rules Required Members To Disclose Bank Accounts Valued At More Than $1,000 If The Total Value Of All Bank Accounts Was More Than $5,000. “Bank Accounts. In order to determine whether deposits in a bank account must be disclosed, you must first add together all interest-bearing checking and savings accounts held by you, your spouse, or a dependent child at every financial institution in which you have such accounts. If the total value of these accounts exceeded $5,000 at the end of the reporting period, then you must disclose each financial institution that held deposits valued at more than $1,000. You must also report any interest-bearing account that generated more than $200 in interest during the reporting period, even if it was valued at less than $1,000 at the close of the reporting period or your total deposits were less than $5,000.” [U.S. House Of Representative Committee On Ethics, Accessed 9/16/21]

House Ethics Rules Required Members To Disclose Bank Accounts Generating More Than $200 In Interest Regardless Of The Account’s Value. “Bank Accounts. In order to determine whether deposits in a bank account must be disclosed, you must first add together all interest-bearing checking and savings accounts held by you, your spouse, or a dependent child at every financial institution in which you have such accounts. If the total value of these accounts exceeded $5,000 at the end of the reporting period, then you must disclose each financial institution that held deposits valued at more than $1,000. You must also report any interest-bearing account that generated more than $200 in interest during the reporting period, even if it was valued at less than $1,000 at the close of the reporting period or your total deposits were less than $5,000.” [U.S. House Of Representative Committee On Ethics, Accessed 9/16/21]

Miller-Meeks Filed False Or Incomplete Information About A Deferred Compensation Agreement With Her Previous Employer

On Her Personal Financial Disclosure, Miller-Meeks Reported Receiving At Least $5,000 From Great River Health System, But Her Spokesperson Said She Did Not Receive Any Income From The Organization. “The only financial information listed on the form is Miller-Meeks’ $100,000 salary as a member of Congress (that despite the report intended to cover the previous full year’s finances for 2020; Miller-Meeks did not become a member of Congress until 2021) and a deferred compensation payout from Great River Health System in Burlington, where Miller-Meeks worked as an ophthalmologist before being elected to Congress. The report, which is required annually of all House members and congressional candidates, does not list the mount of the payout, only that the compensation exceeds $5,000. […] A spokesperson for Miller-Meeks’ office said Miller-Meeks did not
receive any income – salary or benefits – from Great River Health System and did not receive her pension from the Iowa Public Employees Retirement System in 2020.” [Quad-City Times, 9/15/21]

### Miller-Meeks Improperly Disclosed The Income Received Through Her Deferred Compensation Agreement With Great River Health System


*NOTE: The reporting period of Schedule J for first-year members was 2019-2021, but Miller-Meeks did not report any deferred compensation payout or agreement in her previous PFD and was still employed by Great River Health System at the time, indicating that the payout agreement was established sometime after May 15, 2020 (the end of her self-described filing period in her 2019 PFD).*

**Schedule J Was For Compensation Received By “Personally Perform[ing] Services For Clients […] That Generated Fees For Your Employer” And Applied “Only If You Have An Ownership Interest In The Employer.”** “SCHEDULE J COMPENSATION IN EXCESS OF $5,000 PAID BY ONE SOURCE This schedule must be completed by new Members, new employees, and candidates only. If you were employed in a position in which you personally performed services for clients in either of the two preceding calendar years that generated fees for your employer in excess of $5,000, you must identify each of those clients. This requirement applies only if you have an ownership interest in the employer. For example, if you were a partner or member (but not an associate) of a law firm, accounting firm, or lobbying firm, you must disclose the clients or customers of your firm to whom you personally provided services which generated fees in excess of $5,000. The clients or customers of a filer who was the sole proprietor of a business or other professional practice must also be disclosed in the same manner.” [U.S. House Of Representative Committee On Ethics, Accessed 9/16/21]

**Miller-Meeks’ Compensation From Great River Health System Should Have Been Filed On Schedule C Of Her Personal Financial Disclosure Rather Than Schedule J.** “You must disclose the following types of earned income which meet the reporting thresholds above: • Earned income from any source other than your current U.S. government employment. • Pension and retirement payments from any source other than the U.S. government or Social Security. • IRA and 401(k) distributions. • Benefits payments from state or local governments, such as unemployment compensation […] Certain types of earned income, such as pensions from prior employers or deferred compensation for services rendered prior to current legislative employment, do not count against the outside earned income limit for the current year. Nonetheless, such income must be reported on Schedule C.” [U.S. House Of Representative Committee On Ethics, Accessed 9/16/21]

### Miller-Meeks Failed To Properly Report Her Deferred Compensation Agreement On Schedule F Of Her Personal Financial Disclosure


**House Ethics Rules Required Members To Report On Schedule F Any “Continuing Compensation Payments, Such As A Buyout Agreement, Severance Payments, Or Payments Not Yet Received For Previous Work.”** “You must report on Schedule F the parties to and general terms of the following types of agreements: […] For all types of employers, continuing compensation payments, such as a buyout agreement, severance payments, or payments not yet received for previous work.” [U.S. House Of Representative Committee On Ethics, Accessed 9/16/21]
Quad-City Times: Miller-Meeks’ Personal Financial Disclosure Was “Notably Scarce” And Listed Her Congressional Salary Despite The Fact That The Report Was Intended To Cover 2020, Not 2021. “Democrats are raising questions about Iowa freshman Republican U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks’ finances – or apparent lack thereof. Miller-Meeks’ personal financial disclosure form, which she filed with the Clerk of House on Aug. 13, is notably scarce. The only financial information listed on the form is Miller-Meeks’ $100,000 salary as a member of Congress (that despite the report intended to cover the previous full year’s finances for 2020; Miller-Meeks did not become a member of Congress until 2021) and a deferred compensation payout from Great River Health System in Burlington, where Miller-Meeks worked as an ophthalmologist before being elected to Congress. The report, which is required annually of all House members and congressional candidates, does not list the mount of the payout, only that the compensation exceeds $5,000.” [Quad-City Times, 9/15/21]

After Her First Personal Financial Disclosure Filing Raised Questions From Local Reporters, Miller-Meeks Lied About Her Assets And Income

Miller-Meeks’ Spokesperson Said She Had No Outside Income, Including IRAs or 401(k)s, That Were Required To Be Publicly Disclosed, And Claimed She Had Divested Of Her Assets Before Joining Congress

Miller-Meeks’ Spokesperson: “I Can Confirm Through The Congresswoman That She Does Not Have Any Outside Income (IRAs/401ks)” And “She Divested Of Those Assets”

Miller-Meeks’ Spokesperson: “I Can Confirm Through The Congresswoman That She Does Not Have Any Outside Income (IRAs/401ks).” “I can confirm through the Congresswoman that she does not have any outside income (IRAs/401ks),’ according to the spokesperson. ‘The Congresswoman said she divested of those assets (stocks, etc.) before she became a (House) Member. The income reported includes 2021 congressional pay, and the Congresswoman is already working with the House to ensure the filing is complete.’” [Quad-City Times, 9/15/21]

Miller-Meeks’ Spokesperson: “The Congresswoman Said She Divested Of Those Assets” Before Becoming A Member Of Congress. “I can confirm through the Congresswoman that she does not have any outside income (IRAs/401ks),’ according to the spokesperson. ‘The Congresswoman said she divested of those assets (stocks, etc.) before she became a (House) Member. The income reported includes 2021 congressional pay, and the Congresswoman is already working with the House to ensure the filing is complete.’” [Quad-City Times, 9/15/21]

Cedar Rapids Gazette: Miller-Meeks’ Spokesperson “Said Miller-Meeks Does Not Have Any Outside Income, Including From IRAs Or 401(k)s, That She Would Be Required To Report On The Form.” “Will Kiley, a spokesman for Miller-Meeks, said Wednesday his boss now is working with the House to update her form to add her Iowa Senate salary. He said Miller-Meeks does not have any outside income, including from IRAs or 401(k)s, that she would be required to report on the form.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 9/17/21]

Miller-Meeks And Her Husband Actually Had Retirement Accounts Worth Up To $1,360,000 And Total Assets Worth Up To $2,615,000

On Her Amended 2020 PFD, Miller-Meeks Disclosed A Retirement Account Managed By TIAA-CREF Worth Up To $1,030,000. [House Ethics Committee, Amended 2020 Personal Financial Disclosure: Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Filed 10/28/21]

On Her Amended 2020 PFD, Miller-Meeks Disclosed A 401(k) Through Her Previous Employer Worth Up
2021: Miller-Meeks Reported An IRA Withdrawal Of $100,000 As Income

Miller-Meeks’ Spokesperson Said She Did Not Receive Any Income From Her Previous Employer In 2020, But She Actually Received More Than $200,000 That Year

For the full text and source, please refer to the original report.
### Miller-Meeks’ Spokesperson Claimed She Did Not Receive Her Pension In 2020, But She Actually Received Nearly $5,000

Miller-Meeks’ Spokesperson Said She Did Not Receive Her Pension From The Iowa Public Employees Retirement System In 2020. “A spokesperson for Miller-Meeks’ office said Miller-Meeks did not receive any income – salary or benefits – from Great River Health System and did not receive her pension from the Iowa Public Employees Retirement System in 2020.” [Quad-City Times, 9/15/21]

On Her Amended 2020 PFD, Miller-Meeks Disclosed Receiving $4,972 In Income From Her State Pension In 2020 And $4,973 In 2021. [House Ethics Committee, Amended 2020 Personal Financial Disclosure: Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Filed 10/28/21]

### Miller-Meeks Appeared To Have Violated The House Ethics Cap On Outside Income And Failed To Properly Report Her Deferred Compensation Agreement With Her Previous Employer

Miller-Meeks Appeared To Receive More Than $31,000 In Qualified Outside Income In 2021, Which Would Violate A House Ethics Rule Prohibiting Members From Earning Outside Income Above A Set Threshold

On Her Amended 2020 PFD, Miller-Meeks Disclosed Receiving $31,281 In Salary From The State Of Iowa And $200 From The Wapello County Board Of Veterans Affairs In 2021. [House Ethics Committee, Amended 2020 Personal Financial Disclosure: Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Filed 10/28/21]

Members Of The House Were Prohibited From Earning More Than $29,595 In Outside Income In 2021. “The outside earned income of Members, officers, and employees paid at or above the ‘senior staff’ rate ($131,239 in 2020 and $132,552 in 2021) for more than 90 days in a calendar year is subject to an annual earned income limit of 15 percent of the Executive Level II salary. For calendar year 2020, the outside earned income cap for Members and senior staff is $28,845 (for 2021 the cap is $29,595).” [House Ethics Committee, Accessed 11/9/21]

### Miller-Meeks’ Campaign Did Not Clarify Which Years She Was Reporting Outside Earned Income From

Miller-Meeks’ Spokesman Said She Claimed Not To Have Income That She Subsequently Reported Because “There Was A Simple Misunderstanding With Regards To What Was Required To Be Disclosed.” “Asked why the congresswoman claimed not to have income that she has subsequently reported, Kiley responded in an email, ‘There was a simple misunderstanding with regards to what was required to be disclosed.’” [Quad-City Times, 11/16/21]

Miller-Meeks’ Spokesman Did Not Respond To Questions To Clarify For Which Years Miller-Meeks Was Reporting Outside Earned Income. “Kiley did not respond to emailed questions asking to clarify for which years Miller-Meeks was reporting earned income. For example, she listed nearly $210,000 in salary from her Great River Health System for the ‘preceding year’ and nearly $54,000 in salary from her previous employer for the ‘current year.’ She also listed receiving her $31,000 annual Iowa Senate salary for the ‘current year,’ despite resigning the seat to join Congress in January of this year.” [Quad-City Times, 11/16/21]

- Miller-Meeks Reported Receiving $31,000 In Salary From The Iowa Senate In 2021 Despite Resigning The Seat To Join Congress In January. “Kiley did not respond to emailed questions asking to clarify for which years Miller-Meeks was reporting earned income. For example, she listed nearly $210,000 in salary from her Great River Health System for the ‘preceding year’ and nearly $54,000 in salary from her previous employer for the ‘current year.’ She also listed receiving her $31,000 annual Iowa Senate salary for the ‘current
year,’ despite resigning the seat to join Congress in January of this year.” [Quad-City Times, 11/16/21]

Quad-City Times: “Miller-Meeks Appeared To Receive More Than $31,000 In Qualified Outside Income In 2021” Which Would Violate “House Ethics Rules Prohibiting Members Of Congress From Earning Outside Income Above A Set Threshold.” “All told, Miller-Meeks appeared to receive more than $31,000 in qualified outside income in 2021, which would violate a House ethics rules prohibiting members of Congress from earning outside income above a set threshold. For the 2021 calendar year, the income cap for members is $29,595.” [Quad-City Times, 11/16/21]

Miller-Meeks Again Failed To Properly Report Her Deferred Compensation And Pension Agreements With Her Previous Employers On Schedule F Of Her Personal Financial Disclosure


On Her Amended 2020 PFD, Miller-Meeks Disclosed Receiving $4,972 In Income From Her State Pension In 2020 And $4,973 In 2021. [House Ethics Committee, Amended 2020 Personal Financial Disclosure: Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Filed 10/28/21]


Miller-Meeks Previously Did Not Disclose Any Agreements On Schedule F Of Her Original 2020 PFD. [House Ethics Committee, 2020 Personal Financial Disclosure: Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Filed 8/13/21]

House Ethics Rules Required Members To Report On Schedule F Any “Continuing Compensation Payments, Such As A Buyout Agreement, Severance Payments, Or Payments Not Yet Received For Previous Work.” “You must report on Schedule F the parties to and general terms of the following types of agreements: […] For all types of employers, continuing compensation payments, such as a buyout agreement, severance payments, or payments not yet received for previous work.” [U.S. House Of Representative Committee On Ethics, Accessed 9/16/21]

House Ethics Rules Required Members To Report On Schedule F Any “Continued Participation In A Benefit Program, Such As Life Or Health Insurance, 401(k), Or A Pension Or Profit-Sharing Plan.” “You must report on Schedule F the parties to and general terms of the following types of agreements: […] For any employer other than the U.S. government, for your continued participation in a benefit program, such as life or health insurance, 401(k), or a pension or profit-sharing plan.” [U.S. House Of Representative Committee On Ethics, Accessed 9/16/21]

Miller-Meeks Said Republicans Were Better Than Democrats At Holding Their Members Of Congress Accountable And That There Was An Erosion Of Faith In Government

Miller-Meeks: “It Seems To Me That Republicans Do A Better Job Of Holding Their Members Of Congress Accountable Than Democrats.” At a Muscatine County GOP Forum, Miller-Meeks was asked “What measures would you propose to strengthen ethics rules and help restore the public’s confidence in their government? “Miller-Meeks responded “And the other thing, it seems to me that Republicans do a better job of holding their members of Congress accountable than Democrats. We’ve seen that in, you know, members within our own state losing committee memberships, investigations that take place now rightly so. Looking at members of Congress that may have unethical conduct or behavior, we’ve seen politicians from nearby states who have, you know, lost committees lost memberships, or were not supported in their bids for re election. And I think those instances where I find that the Republican Party seems to hold their members more accountable than the Democrat Party, certainly having a
March 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against The For the People Act, Expanding Access To Voting And Overhauling Campaign Finance And Ethics Laws. In March 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against The For The People Act. NPR described the bill: “The [For The People Act] seeks ‘to expand Americans' access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and implement other anti-corruption measures for the purpose of fortifying our democracy, and for other purposes.’ The bill's language calls for a complete overhaul of the current system, which varies widely by state and which critics say promotes unfair barriers to voting. Included in the act is mandatory automatic voter registration, restoring voting rights to people with completed felony sentences and a reversal of state voter ID laws that would allow citizens to make a sworn statement affirming their identity if they were unable to produce an ID. […] in politics by requiring organizations to disclose large donors, and it creates a matching system for small donations.” The motion was agreed to 220 - 210. [HR 1, Vote #62, 3/3/21; CQ, 3/3/21; NPR, 3/3/21]

Miller-Meeks Said There Was An Erosion In Faith The Government. “People want to get ahead, they want government that can be trusted and accountable,’ she said Monday. ‘There’s been such an erosion in our faith in institutions and our faith in government. People who have real-world experience, who have struggled, who have been knocked down and get back up, who keep trying, are raising a family, trying to make ends meet don’t want the same politics as usual.”” [The Gazette, 10/1/19]

2021: Miller-Meeks Was Fined $500 For Twice Violating COVID Protocols By Not Wearing A Mask On The House Floor

May 2021: Miller-Meeks Was One Of Three House Members Fined $500 By the House Ethics Committee For A Second Violation Of The House Floor Mask Mandate. “As the House finished voting on Tuesday afternoon, a group of Republicans gathered on the floor, smiled and huddled for a selfie. None wore masks. They were among about a dozen Republican lawmakers who openly defied last week’s decision by House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) to keep a mask mandate on the House floor until all lawmakers and staff are vaccinated. Now three of those GOP lawmakers — Brian Mast (Fla.), Mariannette Miller-Meeks (Iowa), a physician, and Beth Van Duyne (Tex.) — face $500 fines for breaking the rules, a Capitol official told The Washington Post. All three were fined because this was the second time they defied the mask mandate, while seven other Republicans were issued a first warning.” [Washington Post, 5/19/21]

- Miller-Meeks On House Floor Mask Mandate: “Nancy Pelosi Wants To Fine The Science Not Follow The Science.” “Several GOP lawmakers are risking steep penalties to go mask-less on the House floor. Congresswoman Mariannette Miller-Meeks got hit with a $500 fine for not wearing her mask on the House floor this week. ‘Nancy Pelosi wants to fine the science not follow the science,’ Rep. Miller-Meeks (R-IA) said She says she's fully vaccinated and thinks the House rules miss the opportunity to highlight what the CDC said are the benefits of vaccination. ‘To show Americans that if you were vaccinated you can go without your mask,’ she said.” [WLS 6, 5/21/21]

- Miller-Meeks Was One Of Eight Republican Members Who Refused To Wear A Mask That Day; Others Included Marjorie Taylor Greene, Lauren Boebert, Louie Gohmert, And Thomas Massie. “A Capitol official told USA TODAY that three Republicans will be issued $500 fines for defying the mask rules: Reps. Brian Mast of Florida, Beth Van Duyne of Texas, and Mariannette Miller-Meeks of Iowa. Seven other Republicans will be issued warnings: Thomas Massie of Kentucky, Lauren Boebert of Colorado, Marjorie Taylor Greene of Georgia, Chip Roy of Texas, Bob Good of Virginia, Mary Miller of Illinois, and Louie Gohmert of Texas.” [USA Today, 5/19/21]

June 2021: The House Ethics Committee Upheld Its Fines Issued To Republicans Who Violated The House Floor Mask Mandate, Including Miller-Meeks. The House Ethics Committee announced Friday that it is
upholding the $500 fines issued to a handful of GOP lawmakers who refused to comply with a requirement last month to wear masks on the House floor during the COVID-19 pandemic. Reps. Brian Mast (Fla.), Beth Van Duyne (Texas) and Mariannette Miller-Meeks (Iowa) were among at least six House Republicans who joined in a protest last month against the requirement that everyone wear masks in the House chamber regardless of vaccination status. [The Hill, 6/25/21]

- **HEADLINE:** “House Ethics Panel Upholds $500 Mask Fines Against GOP Lawmakers.” [The Hill, 6/25/21]

---

**Miller-Meeks Raised Campaign Money Off Her Fine For Not Wearing A Mask**

**Miller-Meeks Tweeted A Fundraising Link About Being Fined For Violating The House Floor Mask Mandate.**

---

**As Of January 2022, Miller-Meeks’ Mask Fines Totaled $2,500**

**As Of January 2022, Miller-Meeks Had Been Fined $2,500 For Not Wearing A Mask On The House Floor.** “Rep. Andrew Clyde (R-Ga.) has been fined at least $58,000 for repeatedly violating rules requiring lawmakers to wear masks on the House floor during the COVID-19 pandemic, while Rep. Lauren Boebert (R-Colo.) has been fined $500, the House Ethics Committee revealed Monday. The Ethics Committee further disclosed that a third Republican, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (Iowa), was also fined for not wearing a mask. […] Miller-Meeks was previously fined $500 in May for refusing to wear a mask as part of a protest among several GOP lawmakers who questioned why the House mask mandate was still in effect when the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) was advising at the time that vaccinated people didn't need to wear them. The CDC has since rescinded that guidance following new variants that have caused breakthrough infections in vaccinated people. That means Miller-Meeks is now on the hook for a $2,500 fine, which she did not appeal.” [The Hill, 1/10/22]
Political Relationships

**Significant Findings**

- Miller-Meeks called for Biden to resign over his handling of the Afghanistan withdrawal in August 2021, only to walk back her statement a month later.

- Miller-Meeks claimed her tweet that “President Biden should resign as commander-in-chief” meant that he “should cede his decision-making power over the military to someone else,” not that he should resign the presidency itself.

- Miller-Meeks claimed Biden “has been wrong on every foreign policy decision for the last four decades.”

- Miller-Meeks refused to say how she voted in an internal GOP caucus vote on removing Rep. Liz Cheney (R-WY) from party leadership for her role in investigating the January 6th insurrection.

**President Biden**

**In August 2021, Miller-Meeks Called On President Biden To Resign Over The Withdrawal From Afghanistan, Before Walking Back That Call A Month Later**

August 2021: Miller-Meeks Called For Biden To Resign, Along With Officials Including Blinken And Mayorkas, “Given The Operational Failure Of The Withdrawal” From Afghanistan. “Given the operational failure of the withdrawal, President Biden should resign as commander-in-chief. Sullivan, Austin, Blinken, and Mayorkas should hand in their resignations. I’ve been calling for evacuations since June & now we have multiple needless casualties and injuries.” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 8/26/21]

September 2021: Miller-Meeks Walked Back Her Call For Biden To Resign And Said She Meant He “Should Cede His Decision-Making Power Over The Military To Someone Else.” “Less than a month ago, Miller-Meeks, a combat veteran who retired from the U.S. Army as a lieutenant colonel, tweeted out that she also wanted Biden to resign as commander-in-chief. She clarified with the Press-Citizen on Saturday that she didn't mean Biden should step down as president, but instead should cede his decision-making power over the military to someone else. ‘(Resigning) is a challenging thing to do, but I think there needs to be an acknowledgement of what happened in Afghanistan, the withdrawal and what the plan was,’ she said.” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 9/18/21]

September 2021: Miller-Meeks Said “Our Current President Has Been Wrong On Every Foreign Policy Decision For The Last Four Decades”

September 2021: Miller-Meeks Said “Our Current President Has Been Wrong On Every Foreign Policy Decision For The Last Four Decades.” “Miller-Meeks said that the United States is ‘at a precipice,’ but chose to focus much of her 12 minutes in front of the crowd on issues and events far away from home. She and the other speakers vehemently criticized the Biden administration's choice to withdraw troops from Afghanistan and even called on most of the president's foreign policy team, like Secretary of State Antony Blinken and General Mark Milley, to resign. ‘Our current president has been wrong on every foreign policy decision for the last four decades. And he still hasn't learned good judgement,’ she said. ‘What happened in Afghanistan was incompetent and ineptitude, and let's hope it was only that.’” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 9/18/21]
Miller-Meeks Was One Of The Representatives Who Escort President Biden To His First Joint Congressional Address, And Called His Speech “Well-Toned,” And “Well-Delivered”

Miller-Meeks Was Among The Representatives Who Escort Biden To His Joint Congressional Address. “Miller-Meeks, a Republican, was among the representatives who escort Democratic President Joe Biden into the House to deliver his joint address to Congress on Wednesday. The Press-Citizen reached out for comment but she was not available as she was traveling Thursday.” [Ames Tribune, 4/29/21]

Miller-Meeks Called Biden’s Joint Address To Congress “Well-Toned” And “Well-Delivered.” “Last night, President Biden reiterated some of the same topics he touched on in his Inaugural Address. The President was well-received by Members of Congress, and his speech was well-toned and well-delivered. He spoke on unity, bipartisanship, and coming together as a nation. Unfortunately, I do not believe we have seen much of this in the first 100 days of his Administration.” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 4/29/21]

Miller-Meeks’ Deputy Chief Of Staff Called Secretary Of Agriculture Tom Vilsack “A True DC Bureaucrat That Has Never Farmed A Day In His Life”

Miller-Meeks’ Deputy Chief Of Staff Called Secretary Of Agriculture Tom Vilsack “A True DC Bureaucrat That Has Never Farmed A Day In His Life.” “Written by a true DC bureaucrat that has never farmed a day in his life.” QUOTE TWEET @SecVilsack: “Keeping step-up in basis doesn’t protect farmers, it protects investors. The people who are going to pay tax under the proposal have never plowed an acre.”

Written by a true DC bureaucrat that has never farmed a day in his life.

Endorsements

Americans For Prosperity Action Endorsed Miller-Meeks’ 2022 Re-Election Campaign

Dec. 2021: Americans For Prosperity Action Endorsed Miller-Meeks’ Campaign. “Americans for Prosperity Action (AFP Action) today announced its endorsement of two candidates, Iowa state Sen. Zach Nunn (IA-03) and Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-01), vying for the U.S. House of Representatives. These candidates have shown active leadership on key issues and if elected and re-elected, will work to build broad-based policy coalitions to break barriers standing in the way of individual prosperity.” [Americans For Prosperity Action, Press Release, 12/13/21]

Former Iowa Governor Terry Branstad Endorsed Miller-Meeks’ 2022 Re-Election Campaign

Nov. 2021: Former Gov. Terry Branstad Endorsed Miller-Meeks’ Campaign. “Governor Branstad has been a supporter of mine since the beginning and I am honored to have his endorsement for my re-election campaign. #IA01” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 11/30/21]
### South Carolina Senator Tim Scott Endorsed Miller-Meeks’ 2022 Re-Election Campaign

Nov. 2021: Sen. Tim Scott Endorsed Miller-Meeks’ Reelection Campaign. “Sen. Tim Scott, a top fundraiser heading into his reelection campaign next year, endorsed contenders in nine competitive House races Tuesday, positioning the South Carolina Republican as a rainmaker for his party and fueling speculation about his ambitions beyond 2022. Scott, who is favored for a second full Senate term and had nearly $19 million in his campaign account on Sept. 30, plans to offer a fundraising boost to eight House GOP incumbents and one candidate, Army veteran Wesley Hunt, who is seeking the Republican nomination in Texas’ new 38th District. The incumbents endorsed by Scott are Iowa’s Ashley Hinson and Mariannette Miller-Meeks; California’s Michelle Steel, Young Kim and David Valadao; Florida’s María Elvira Salazar and Byron Donalds; and Utah’s Burgess Owens.” [Roll Call, 11/16/21]

### Senator Joni Ernst Endorsed Miller-Meeks’ 2022 Re-Election Campaign

Nov. 2021: Sen. Joni Ernst Endorsed Miller-Meeks’ Reelection Campaign. “Senator @joniernst has served Iowa and our nation with dignity and honor, and its my great privilege to receive her endorsement as I seek re-election and the opportunity to continue to represent Iowans in Washington. #IA01” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 11/16/21]

### Governor Kim Reynolds Endorsed Miller-Meeks’ 2022 Re-Election Campaign

Nov. 2021: Gov. Kim Reynolds Endorsed Miller-Meeks’ Reelection Campaign. “Washington is broken and President Biden’s reckless policies are hurting everyday Iowans at the grocery store, at the gas pump, and at their workplace. Iowans need someone they can count on and Dr. Miller-Meeks is fighting for us every step of the way. She has my full support!” [Twitter, @KimReynoldsIA, 11/15/21]

### Illinois Congressional Candidate Esther Joy King Endorsed Miller-Meeks’ 2022 Re-Election Campaign

November 2021: Esther Joy King Said She Was “Proud To Support” Miller-Meeks In Her Reelection Campaign In Iowa’s New First Congressional District. “Proud to support the fellow Battle-Ready Fighter, @millermeeks, in her announcement for re-election in IA-1 Congressional District! Representing both sides of the Mississippi River in the QCA.” [Twitter, @esther4congress, 11/10/21]

### Zach Nunn Endorsed Miller-Meeks’ 2022 Re-Election Campaign

November 2021: Zach Nunn Gave Miller-Meeks His “Full Support” After She Announced Her Reelection Campaign In Iowa’s New First Congressional District. “As I continue my fight against Cindy Axne in #IA03 I wish @millermeeks all the best in IA-01 with my full support!” [Twitter, @NunnForCongress, 11/10/21]

### Nikki Haley’s Stand For America PAC Endorsed Miller-Meeks’ 2022 Re-Election Campaign

June 2021: Nikki Haley’s Stand For America PAC Had Endorsed Miller-Meeks For 2022. “Former South Carolina governor and former U.S. ambassador to the United Nations Nikki Haley encouraged a crowd of Scott County Republicans to ‘double down’ on their support of freshman Republican U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks. Haley headlined a fundraiser Saturday at Crow Valley Golf Club in Davenport for Miller-Meeks, who won last year’s election for Iowa’s 2nd district U.S. House seat by six votes, the narrowest victory margin in a House race in almost 40 years, after Democrat Rita Hart ended her 2020 election challenge before the U.S. House in March. ‘I like to say I got elected by more than six votes. Six is what they cheated me down to,’ Miller-Meeks told the crowd of roughly 90 supporters. Haley, viewed as a potential presidential candidate in 2024, campaigned for Miller-Meeks last fall. And, Haley’s Stand For America PAC issued its first endorsement of the 2022 election cycle
to Miller-Meeks. ‘We need to double down,’ Haley said if Republicans have any hope of holding onto the congressional seat and winning back the House in the 2022 midterms. ‘The first race is hard. The second race is harder. ... And they're going to put even more money into trying to defeat her this time. So what we want to do is have the wind at her back.’” [Quad-City Times, 6/26/21]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maggie’s List Endorsed Miller-Meeks’ 2022 Re-Election Campaign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>June 2021: Maggie’s List Endorsed Miller-Meeks’ 2022 Re-Election Campaign.</strong> “Aiming to build on successes in last year's elections, a leading outside group that's dedicated to electing conservative women to federal office is unveiling its first round of endorsements in the 2021-2022 cycle. […] Also on the list are Reps. Ashley Hinson and Mariannette Miller-Meeks of Iowa, two freshman representatives who narrowly won election last November. […] ‘Voters made history in 2020 by electing the largest-ever group of conservative women to federal office, and we are ready to build upon those gains in upcoming elections,’ Maggie’s List President Sandra Mortham told Fox News.” [Fox News, 6/22/21]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Winning For Women Super PAC Endorsed Miller-Meeks’ 2022 Re-Election Campaign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>June 2021: Winning For Women Super PAC Endorsed Miller-Meeks’ Campaign.</strong> “Winning for Women, the Republican super PAC dedicated to electing women, released its first round of endorsements for the 2022 midterm elections Tuesday, telling Fox News the ‘road to the majority runs through’ these candidates' districts, while vowing to make the next cycle ‘another record year for Republican women.’ […] Winning for Women endorsed GOP Reps. Young Kim of California, Michelle Steel of California, Maria Elvira Salazar of Florida, Ashley Hinson of Iowa, Mariannette Miller-Meeks of Iowa, Nicole Malliotakis of New York, Stephanie Bice of Oklahoma, Nancy Mace of South Carolina, and Beth Van Duyne of Texas.” [Fox News, 6/15/21]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campaign Appearances And Endorsements Of Other Republicans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>August 2021: Miller-Meeks Endorsed And Appeared At Ashley Hinson’s Re-Election Campaign Launch</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Hinson: “I'm So Proud To Be On A Team With Randy, And My Great Friend Mariannette Miller-Meeks.” “This is a team sport, what we do as Republicans, fighting for those conservative values is a team sport. And I'm so proud to be on a team with [Rep.] Randy [Feenstra], and my great friend Mariannette Miller-Meeks,” said Rep. Ashley Hinson, R-Iowa. Hinson announced her reelection campaign three weeks ago in a similar fashion, with Sen. Ted Cruz, R-Texas, as her star speaker.” [Daily Iowan, 9/18/21]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>August 2021: Miller-Meeks Spoke At Hinson’s Campaign Launch.</strong> “On Saturday, Miller-Meeks spoke at a barbecue hosted by fellow freshman Rep. Ashley Hinson, R-Iowa, along with other Republicans from Iowa and elsewhere, including Sen. Ted Cruz, R-Texas. At the event, Hinson launched her reelection campaign. Speakers emphasized their goal of Republicans taking back the U.S. House and Senate in 2022.” [Daily Iowan, 8/30/21]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miller-Meeks Endorsed Chuck Grassley’s 2022 Re-Election Campaign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miller-Meeks Said She Was “Proud To Support Chuck Grassley For Re-Election.”</strong> “I’m proud to support Chuck Grassley for re-election! I have seen up close his tremendous work ethic and his never-quit attitude. We need that now more than ever in the US Senate!” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 9/24/21]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miller-Meeks Refused To Say How She Voted On Removing Liz Cheney From House Republican Party Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miller-Meeks Refused To Say How She Voted On Removing Liz Cheney From House Republican Party</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Leadership. “Miller-Meeks would not say how she voted with regard to stripping Cheney of her leadership position but reiterated the House GOP caucus has lost confidence in her ability to present a unified message ahead of next year’s midterm elections. ‘If I wanted you to know what I had for dinner, I'd invite you over to eat,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘I think it’s irrelevant,’ adding the focus should be on ‘What's Biden doing?’ in regards to government spending, jobs and the economy, border security and instability in the Middle East.” [Quad-City Times, 5/20/21]

Mike Pence Attended An Iowa Republican Party Event With Miller-Meeks

July 2021: Miller-Meeks Spoke At The Feenstra Family Picnic With Mike Pence. “Pence, who spoke for more than 25 minutes at the Feenstra Family Picnic, could be laying the groundwork for a 2024 presidential run in Iowa, site of the first contest in the nomination season. Just last month, Arkansas Sen. Tom Cotton, another potential Republican presidential candidate, spoke at the same Sioux Center venue during an Iowa GOP fundraiser. […] A parade of other GOP speakers spoke to the picnic-goers during an Iowa GOP fundraiser. […] A parade of other GOP speakers spoke to the picnic-goers Friday, including U.S. Sen. Joni Ernst and U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, who represents an eastern Iowa congressional district. Like Miller-Meeks, Feenstra is a first-term House member.” [Quad City Times, 7/31/21]

Mike Pompeo Spoke At A Fundraiser With Mike Pompeo

July 16, 2021: Miller-Meeks Was Scheduled To Hold A Fundraiser With Mike Pompeo. “Pence is due to headline a midday fundraiser in Sioux Center for Congressman Randy Feenstra. Early this evening, Pompeo will speak at a fundraiser in Ottumwa for Congresswoman Mariannette Miller-Meeks.” [Radio Iowa, 7/16/21]

Nikki Haley Endorsed, Fundraised For, And Praised Miller-Meeks

June 2021: Nikki Haley Headlined A Fundraiser For Miller-Meeks. “Former South Carolina governor and former U.S. ambassador to the United Nations Nikki Haley encouraged a crowd of Scott County Republicans to ‘double down’ on their support of freshman Republican U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks. Haley headlined a fundraiser Saturday at Crow Valley Golf Club in Davenport for Miller-Meeks, who won last year's election for Iowa's 2nd district U.S. House seat by six votes, the narrowest victory margin in a House race in almost 40 years, after Democrat Rita Hart ended her 2020 election challenge before the U.S. House in March. ‘I like to say I got elected by more than six votes. Six is what they cheated me down to,’ Miller-Meeks told the crowd of roughly 90 supporters. Haley, viewed as a potential presidential candidate in 2024, campaigned for Miller-Meeks last fall. And, Haley's Stand For America PAC issued its first endorsement of the 2022 election cycle to Miller-Meeks. ‘We need to double down,’ Haley said if Republicans have any hope of holding onto the congressional seat and winning back the House in the 2022 midterms. ‘The first race is hard. The second race is harder. ... And they're going to put even more money into trying to defeat her this time. So what we want to do is have the wind at her back.’” [Quad-City Times, 6/26/21]

Nikki Haley Called Miller-Meeks A “Rock Star” Who “Ran Circles Around Nancy Pelosi.” “‘She is small, but she is mighty,’ Haley told the crowd, calling Miller-Meeks a ‘rock star.’ ‘No one had to start their congressional career wondering if they were even going to stay in the seat, wondering how they were going to battle the challenger that kept on poking and knowing the Speaker of the House wanted her out,’ Haley said. ‘But, what did she do? She hunkered down. She got to work. She ran circles around Nancy Pelosi. It's put a bigger target on her back, because they see that she's smart, she's tough and she's willing to get things done.’” [Quad-City Times, 6/26/21]

Nikki Haley: Miller-Meeks “Was At The Border Before (Vice President) Kamala (Harris) Ever Even Thought About Going To The Border.” “‘She knows where her priorities are,’ Haley said, which includes ‘pushing back on the ridiculous spending’ proposals put forward by President Joe Biden's administration, ‘elections bills that are trying to kill our integrity’ and ‘anything that's trying to hurt our legal immigration.’ ‘She was at the border before (Vice President) Kamala (Harris) ever even thought about going to the border,’ Haley said of Miller-Meeks to applause from the crowd.” [Quad-City Times, 6/26/21]

**Miller-Meeks Praised Tom Cotton, And Campaigned With Him In Iowa**

**Miller-Meeks: Tom Cotton Was “A National Voice Who Understands Where Our Country Should Go And The Domestic Policies That Should Get Us There.”** “Miller-Meeks, an Iowa Republican, will hold the inaugural ‘MMM Tailgate Celebration’ on September 18, at 11:00 a.m. at Streb Construction in Iowa City before the Hawkeyes' game against Kent State University. Cotton will be the fundraising event's keynote speaker. ‘Tom Cotton has been described as one of the Republican Party’s ‘rising stars,’ but he’s already proven his ability to shine as a national voice who understands where our country should go and the domestic policies that should get us there,’ Miller-Meeks said in a statement. ‘He has a clear vision of America’s place in the global community and what it will take to maintain our role as a beacon for freedom.’” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 8/16/21]

**Sep. 2021: Miller-Meeks Was Scheduled To Hold A Campaign Event With Tom Cotton.** “I’m excited to announce that on Saturday, September 18th, I’ll be having my Inaugural MMM Tailgate Celebration! I hope you’ll join me and special guest, U.S. Senator @TomCottonAR!” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 8/16/21]

**June 2021: Sen. Cotton Endorsed Miller-Meeks And Included Her In His Veterans To Victory Program To Support Republican Military Veteran Congressional Candidates.** “Sen. Tom Cotton is heading to Iowa to launch Veterans to Victory, a program the Arkansas Republican and prospective 2024 presidential candidate is starting to elect and reelect Republican military veterans to Congress. […] Cotton is endorsing Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, an Army veteran who represents Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District. The Iowa caucus is traditionally the first contest on the Republican Party’s presidential nominating calendar, and the state has already seen a parade of GOP 2024 hopefuls travel there to lend a hand to Republican Gov. Kim Reynolds and down-ballot candidates since former President Donald Trump left the White House.” [Washington Examiner, 6/28/21]

**Politico: Sen. Cotton Was “In Regular Contact” With Miller-Meeks And Was Expected To Campaign And Fundraise For Her And Fund Attack Ads Against Her Eventual Democratic Opponent.** “Cotton has also been in regular contact with several members of Iowa’s congressional delegation, including Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, who in 2020 won the election by a razor-thin, six-vote margin. Coinciding with his trip to Iowa this week, Cotton is set to launch a program aimed at bolstering military veterans such as Miller-Meeks. As part of the effort, the Arkansas Republican is expected to campaign for the freshman congresswoman, raise money for her and fund attack ads against her eventual Democratic opponent.” [Politico, 6/28/21]

**Sen. Tom Cotton Planned To Campaign In Iowa With Miller-Meeks.** “Republican Sen. Tom Cotton is heading to Iowa this summer, but he won’t be campaigning for himself — at least not officially. The potential 2024 contender is plotting a swing through the state — home of the first-in-the-nation presidential caucuses — to stump for three freshmen House Republicans as part of a broader, two-year effort to bolster congressional candidates.” [Politico, 5/30/21]

**December 2021: Miller-Meeks Endorsed Roby Smith’s Campaign For Iowa Treasurer**

**Dec. 2021: Miller-Meeks Endorsed Roby Smith’s Campaign For Iowa Treasurer.** “Proud to endorse @RobySmithIA campaign for Iowa Treasurer! Roby is a dedicated public servant who will continue to fight for strong fiscal policies that Iowans can count on.” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 12/15/21]
Oct. 2021: Miller-Meeks Said Randy Feenstra Had Her “Full Support” In His Reelection Campaign. “Iowans know @RandyFeenstra delivers, but there's more to do! We need Randy in Congress fighting for us, and he has my full support!” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 10/20/21]
Donald Trump

**Significant Findings**

✓ Miller-Meeks voted against impeaching Trump for inciting the January 6th insurrection, claiming it would only “create a bigger wedge and divide in our country.”

✓ Miller-Meeks opposed Trump’s first impeachment for soliciting foreign election interference, describing it as “like Kavanaugh 2.0” and arguing the proper way for Trump’s opponents to hold him accountable was to vote him out of office in 2020.

✓ On January 7th, 2021, Miller-Meeks insisted “there was fraud” and “there were irregularities” in the 2020 presidential election that Trump lost, and argued for investigations of fraud and of “states that violated their own legislative codes.”

✓ From January-September 2021, Miller-Meeks accepted more than $50,000 from “sedition caucus” members of Congress who voted to overturn the 2020 election results, though she herself voted to uphold the results.

✓ Miller-Meeks appeared at an October 2021 Trump rally where he falsely claimed he was the rightful president and Biden was not legitimately elected.

✓ In 2019, Miller-Meeks voted to prohibit Iowa’s attorney general from joining lawsuits against the Trump administration.

✓ In 2016, Miller-Meeks tweeted that both Trump and Hillary Clinton were “liars and corrupt,” and equated Trump’s “vulgar and disgusting” comments on the Access Hollywood tape to “revolting” actions by Bill and Hillary Clinton.

---

**Impeachment**

**January 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Impeaching Trump For Incitement Of An Insurrection And Said Impeachment “Would Create A Bigger Wedge And Divide In Our Country”**

Miller-Meeks Voted Against Impeaching Trump For Incitement Of An Insurrection. In January 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against “Adoption of the article of impeachment that would impeach President Donald Trump for incitement of insurrection by ‘inciting violence against the government of the United States.’ Specifically, it would state that Trump ‘repeatedly issued false statements’ asserting that the results of the 2020 presidential election were the product of widespread fraud and should not be accepted or certified. It would state that Trump made statements at a rally on Jan. 6, 2020, that ‘encouraged -- and foreseeably resulted in -- lawless action’ at the Capitol building during the certification of electoral college votes, during which protesters entered the Capitol, attacked law enforcement personnel, ‘menaced’ members of Congress and the vice president, and engaged in other ‘violent, deadly, destructive, and seditious acts.’ It would state that Trump's conduct on Jan. 6 followed prior efforts ‘to subvert and obstruct’ the certification of 2020 presidential election results, including during a Jan. 2 phone call during which he urged Georgia Secretary of State Brad Raffensperger to ‘find’ enough votes to overturn the state's presidential election results and ‘threatened Secretary Raffensperger if he failed to do so.’ It would state President Trump's ‘endangered the security of the United States and its institutions of government’ and that he ‘threatened the integrity of the democratic system, interfered with the peaceful transition of power, and imperiled a coordinate branch of government.’ Pursuant to the rule (H Res 41), upon adoption of the article of impeachment, the House
agreed to the resolution (H Res 40) that would appoint and authorize the following impeachment trial managers to conduct the impeachment trial against President Donald Trump in the Senate: Reps. Raskin, D-Md., DeGette, D-Colo., Cicilline, D-R.I., Castro, D-Texas, Swalwell, D-Calif., Lieu, D-Calif., Plaskett, D-V.I., Neguse, D-Colo., and Dean, D-Pa.” The article of impeachment was adopted, 232-197. [H. Res. 24, Vote #17, 1/13/21; CQ, 1/13/21]

**Miller-Meeks Said Impeaching Trump In January 2021 Would “Only Further Divide The Nation” And “There Are Other Ways To Hold The President Accountable”**

**Miller-Meeks: Impeaching Trump “With 7 Days Remaining In His Term Would Only Further Divide The Nation And Make It More Difficult For President-Elect Joe Biden To Unify And Lead Our Nation.”**

“WASHINGTON, D.C. – Today, January 13th, 2021, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02) issued the following statement regarding her opposition to articles of impeachment: ‘As horrific as the events of January 6 were, President Trump has conceded and committed to an orderly transition of power on January 20. Impeaching him with 7 days remaining in his term would only further divide the nation and make it more difficult for President-Elect Joe Biden to unify and lead our nation. The people of Iowa sent me to Congress to work on health care reform, lower the cost of prescription drugs, and get Iowans safely back to work. That will be my focus.’” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 1/13/21]

**Miller-Meeks: Removing Trump Following The January 6th Insurrection “Would Create A Bigger Wedge And Divide In Our Country” Rather Than “Heal Our Nation.”**

“Iowa Republican U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, who joined Congress provisionally this week while her election is being contested, said Thursday she thinks Trump should finish out his term. Removing him, she said, wouldn't help 'heal our nation.' ‘To go through another impeachment process, I think, would create a bigger wedge and divide in our country,’ she said. 'It is time for compassion. It is time for understanding.’” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 1/8/21]

**Miller-Meeks Said “There Are Other Ways To Hold The President Accountable” Regarding Impeachment Talks Following The January 6th Insurrection.**

“’Iowa freshman Republican U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks on Wednesday said ‘there are other ways to hold the president accountable’ for last week's deadly ‘rampage’ at the U.S. Capitol besides impeachment. ‘As horrific and devastating as the rampage on the Capitol was on Jan. 6, President Trump has conceded. He has committed to a peaceful and orderly transition of power on Jan. 20,’ Miller-Meeks said Wednesday morning, speaking on a news radio program on WMT-AM in Cedar Rapids, as the U.S. House for a second time deliberated impeaching President Donald Trump. Miller-Meeks reiterated on Wednesday that impeaching Trump a week shy of the end of his term would ‘only further divide the nation and make it more difficult for President-elect Joe Biden to unify and lead our nation.’” [Quad-City Times, 1/13/21]

**HEADLINE: “Miller-Meeks: Trump Should Stay And ‘Plenty Of Blame To Go Around’ For US Capitol Riot.”** [Quad-City Times, 1/7/21]

**Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Resolution Calling On Vice President Pence To Invoke The 25th Amendment And Remove Trump From Office**

**Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Resolution Calling On Vice President Pence To Invoke The 25th Amendment And Remove Trump From Office.** In January 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against “Agreeing to the resolution that would state that the House of Representatives calls on Vice President Mike Pence to use his powers under section 4 of the 25th Amendment to convene and mobilize members of the president's cabinet to declare that President Donald Trump is unable to successfully discharge the duties and powers of his office, and to transmit notice to Congress that Pence will immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as acting president. The resolution would state among its findings that Trump ‘widely advertised and broadly encouraged’ participation in the march on the U.S. Capitol on Wednesday, Jan. 6, which turned into a violent insurrectionary mob that resulted in 5 deaths following the storming of the Capitol building; did not appeal to his followers to exit the Capitol during the insurrection; refused to accept the results of the 2020 presidential election as legitimate; and made at least three attempts to intervene in the vote counting and certification process in the state of Georgia and to ‘coerce’ its state
officials to declare him the winner of the state’s electoral votes.” The resolution passed, 223-205. [H. Res. 21, Vote #14, 1/12/21; CQ, 1/12/21]

**Miller-Meeks Voted Against Blocking Republican-Proposed Commissions Intended To “Deflect The Anger Directed At Trump” And Considered To Be Alternatives To Impeaching Trump**

**Miller-Meeks Voted Against Blocking A Resolution Establishing A Bipartisan 9/11-Style Commission To Investigate The January 6th Attack On The U.S. Capitol.** In January 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against a “McGovern, D-Mass., motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and possibility of amendment) on the rule (H Res 41).” According to the Congressional Record, Rep. Cole stated: “Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to immediately bring up a resolution establishing a bipartisan national commission on the domestic terrorist attack on the United States Capitol. This proposed bipartisan commission will be tasked with examining and reporting upon the terror attack upon our Capitol that occurred last Wednesday. The commission will be bipartisan in nature, modeled after the 9/11 Commission, and will fully be empowered to undertake a full investigation and make recommendations to the President and to Congress. I can think of no more appropriate path for Congress to follow than by ensuring a bipartisan commission reviews all evidence and reports back to us on this horrific event.” A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of the resolution. The motion was agreed to, 221-205. [H. Res. 41, Vote #15, 1/13/21; CQ, 1/13/21]

- **Republicans Proposed The Commission As An Alternative To Impeaching Trump For His Role In The January 6th Capitol Insurrection.** “House Republicans argued Wednesday that instead of impeaching President Donald Trump, Congress should create a commission to study what happened last week. Modeled after the bipartisan commission that analyzed the 9/11 terrorism attacks, the body would recommend how to prevent attacks on the Capitol in the future. ‘I can think of no more appropriate path for Congress to follow,’ said Oklahoma Rep. Tom Cole, the top Republican on the House Rules Committee.” [USA Today, 1/13/21]

**Miller-Meeks Voted Against Blocking A Resolution Establishing A Bipartisan 9/11-Style Commission To Investigate The January 6th Attack On The U.S. Capitol.** In January 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against “Agreeing to the Scanlon, D-Pa., motion to order the previous question (thus ending the debate and possibility of amendment).” According to the Congressional Record, Rep. Cole stated: “Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to immediately bring up a resolution establishing a bipartisan national commission on the domestic terrorist attack on the United States Capitol. This commission, modeled on the 9/11 Commission, will be charged with examining and reporting upon the facts and causes relating to the attack that occurred on January 6 of 2021 and with providing appropriate findings, conclusions, and recommendations for corrective measures. I can think of no more appropriate path for Congress to follow, Mr. Speaker, than to ensure that a bipartisan commission reviews all evidence and reports back to us on this horrific event.” A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of the resolution. The motion was agreed to, 219-206. [H. Res. 21, Vote #12, 1/21/21; CQ, 1/12/21]

- **Republicans Proposed The Commission In Effort To “Deflect The Anger Directed At Trump” Amid Democratic Calls For Vice President Pence To Invoke The 25th Amendment And Remove Trump From The Presidency.** “The House passed on Tuesday evening a searing resolution urging Vice President Mike Pence to invoke the 25th Amendment to expel President Donald Trump for inciting the violent mob that stormed the Capitol last week […] Republicans sought to deflect the anger directed at Trump by proposing a commission to investigate the forces and causes behind the insurrection. Rep. Tom Cole, an Oklahoma Republican, called the effort to prod Pence ‘misguided and inappropriate,’ noting that the 25th Amendment gives Congress no explicit role in suggesting a vice president to declare a president unfit.” [Dallas Morning News, 1/12/21]

**Miller-Meeks Wondered Whether Trump’s Impeachment Trial Was “Like Kavanaugh 2.0”**
Miller-Meeks Wondered Whether Trump’s Impeachment Trial Was “Like Kavanaugh 2.0.” According to an interview she gave on Caffeinated Thoughts Podcast, when asked for her “thoughts on what she’s heard from witnesses during the impeachment”, Miller-Meeks said, “The concerns that I have about the process is 1. That it has not been transparent, and you really wonder if this is like Kavanaugh 2.0. The intelligence committee changing what they think is a whistleblower, at the time a whistleblower came forward. This whole process of changing the rules of what’s considered a whistleblower, that was problematic. I see that the way the process has unfolded has not been transparent. It has not been a bipartisan process. You wonder if they are trying to overturn an a duly elected president.” [Caffeinated Thoughts, 00:07:10, 12/3/19] (AUDIO)

**Miller-Meeks: “One Way To Hold Government Accountable Is At Election Time To Throw People Out Of Office If You Don’t Think They’re Doing Their Job”**

**2020 Election Results**

**Miller-Meeks Said “There Was Fraud” And “There Were Irregularities” In The 2020 Presidential Election And Called For An Investigation, Despite Court Decisions Citing A Lack Of Evidence**

Quad-City Times: Miller-Meeks “Insisted ‘There Was Fraud’ In The 2020 Presidential Election, Despite A Series Of Reviews And Court Cases That Found No Evidence Of Widespread Issues.” “Miller-Meeks in an interview with the Quad-City Times last week, while recognizing Democrat Joe Biden as president-elect and voting to reject a challenge to Biden's Electoral College victory, insisted ‘there was fraud’ in the 2020 presidential election, despite a series of reviews and court cases that found no evidence of widespread issues. ‘I think in order to listen to people and to heal our nation — to answer those grievances — that there should be either an investigation or a commission to look into that,’ she said. ‘There was fraud. There were irregularities. There were states that did not follow their state law, and/or election officials violated state law. I think all of those things are worthwhile to address so that everyone has faith and confidence and trust in the election system.’” [Quad-City Times, 1/13/21]

**Miller-Meeks: “There Were Irregularities” In The 2020 Presidential Election And “There Were States That Violated Their Own Legislative Codes. And That's Something That I Think Can Be Looked At And Should Be Looked At.”** PRICE: “But did fraud cost him the election or not?” MILLER-MEEKS: “I’d say that there were irregularities and that there were states that violated their own legislative codes. And that's something that I think can be looked at and should be looked at. And I think states should be very proactive in looking at how they can improve their election system.” [YouTube, WHO13, 11/7/21] (VIDEO) 00:06:08

January 2021: When Asked Whether She Regretted Not Doing More To Push Back On Trump’s Claims About Election Fraud, Miller-Meeks Said “Every Individual, Whether A Candidate For Office Or Not, Is Personally Responsible For Their Own Comments And Conduct.” “Iowa's Republican congressional and statewide leaders have addressed the topic of election fraud in recent weeks, but to varying degrees of clarity and vagueness. As Trump departs and President-elect Joe Biden is sworn in, The Gazette-Lee Des Moines Bureau asked Iowa Republican for specific responses to the same three questions: whether they acknowledge Biden as the next president; whether they believe the election was free and fair; and whether they regret not doing more to push back at Trump's baseless claims about election fraud. The bureau posed the questions to Iowa's top Republican
officials: U.S. Sens. Chuck Grassley and Joni Ernst; U.S. Reps. Ashley Hinson, Mariannette Miller-Meeks and Randy Feenstra; Gov. Kim Reynolds; and state party Chairman Jeff Kaufmann. […] Said Miller-Meeks, ‘Every individual, whether a candidate for office or not, is personally responsible for their own comments and conduct. I supported President Trump based on his policies and results for the American people and our country such as cutting taxes and decreasing business regulations. Prior to COVID, those policies created an unparalleled economic boom with expansive job growth and wage increases.’” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 1/18/21]

**Quad-City Times: Miller-Meeks Gave “Credence To The False Claims Of Widespread Voting Irregularities” And Called For An Investigation Into Voter Fraud In The 2020 Election.** “Miller-Meeks voted Wednesday to reject a challenge to Biden's Electoral College victory, believing Congress did not have the constitutional authority to overturn state election results. But, on Thursday Miller-Meeks continued to give credence to the false claims of widespread voting irregularities. ‘I think in order to listen to people and to heal our nation — to answer those grievances — that there should be either an investigation or a commission to look into that,’ she said. ‘There was fraud. There were irregularities. There were states that did not follow their state law, and/or election officials violated state law. I think all of those things are worthwhile to address so that everyone has faith and confidence and trust in the election system.’” [Quad-City Times, 1/7/21]

**Miller-Meeks Accepted More Than $50,000 In Campaign Contributions From Members Who Objected To The 2020 Electoral College Vote Count.**

“Miller-Meeks accepted more than $50,000 in campaign contributions from members who objected to the 2020 Electoral College vote count. ‘In that view, Rep. Young Kim (R-CA) is out front. The Orange County conservative, who in 2020 unseated incumbent Democrat Gil Cisneros in a close race, has reported $92,000 in contributions from objectors this year, FEC data shows. Kim was followed by Reps. Miller-Meeks, Valadao, Rodney Davis (R-IL), Andrew Garbarino (R-NY), and Brian Fitzpatrick (R-PA), who have all accepted more than $50,000. The group was rounded out by Reps. Ashley Hinson (R-IA), Katko, Tony Gonzalez (R-TX), Don Bacon (R-NE), and Ann Wagner (R-MO), who received the least support: $41,000.” [Daily Beast, 11/10/21]

- **Miller-Meeks Herself Voted Against Objecting To The Electoral College Vote Count.** “Only Boebert appears to have donated to a Republican who voted to uphold the election, with a single $1,500 donation to Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (R-IA) at the end of June.” [Daily Beast, 11/10/21]

**October 2021: Miller-Meeks Appeared At A Rally With Trump Where He Falsely Claimed He Was The Rightful President**

“The Hill: Miller-Meeks Was Among The GOP Lawmakers Who “Appeared Recently With Trump At Public Events Where The Former President Has Riled The Crowd With False Claims That He's The Rightful Commander In Chief.” “Other GOP lawmakers — like Iowa Reps. Mariannette Miller-Meeks and Ashley Hinson — have appeared recently with Trump at public events where the former president has riled the crowd with false claims that he's the rightful commander in chief. Still others are pressing party leaders to make election integrity a central plank of the 2022 platform, even as many in the party are hoping to turn the page and focus on Biden's challenges.” [The Hill, 10/17/21]

**CNN: Miller-Meeks “Appeared Alongside Trump As He Continued To Falsely Claim That Biden Did Not Win The White House Legitimately.”** “Sen. Chuck Grassley, the longest-serving GOP senator currently in office, and Reps. Ashley Hinson and Mariannette Miller-Meeks, two freshman swing district Republicans who were vocal proponents of certifying the 2020 election results, all appeared alongside Trump as he continued to falsely claim that Biden did not win the White House legitimately.” [CNN, 10/13/21]

**Miller-Meeks Was Booed And Called A “RINO” At The Trump Rally**

“Iowa Capital Dispatch: At Trump’s Rally In Iowa, “Some People Jeered At Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks...”
And Grassley, Calling Them ‘RINOs.’” “Thousands of people gathered at the Iowa State Fairgrounds on Saturday night for Trump’s ‘Save America’ rally. Iowa’s Republican leaders focused on Trump’s legacy as they urged people to vote in upcoming elections. […] Reynolds was a fan-favorite among the thousands of attendees. While some people jeered at Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks and Grassley, calling them ‘RINOs,’ Reynolds was met with a standing ovation.” [Iowa Capital Dispatch, 10/9/21]

December 2020: Miller-Meeks Said Trump “Should Go Through All The Legal Options That Are Available To Him”

Miller-Meeks: “Just As My Opponent Is Going Through All Maneuvers […] I Think The President, President Trump Should Go Through All The Legal Options That Are Available To Him As Well.” “Asked whether Miller-Meeks recognizes Biden's win, Woolson pointed to her comments during a Dec. 4 taping of ‘Iowa Press.’ Miller-Meeks said Trump was ‘going through the legal process as my opponent is going through, but I think that all transition services should be available to President-elect Biden, that at this point in time the way that the courts have ruled and the Electoral College votes have gone, President-elect Biden will be assuming office.’ ‘But I do think that just as my opponent is going through all maneuvers, even though they jumped over the Iowa courts, I think the President, President Trump should go through all the legal options that are available to him as well,’ Miller-Meeks said.” [Quad-City Times, 12/16/20]

Lawsuits Against The Trump Administration

Miller-Meeks Voted Along Party Lines To Prohibit The Democrat Attorney General From Joining Lawsuits That Targeted The Trump Administration

2019: Miller-Meeks Voted For Prohibiting The Attorney General From Joining Out-Of-State Lawsuits. Miller-Meeks voted for SF 615, “a bill for an Attorney General’s statutory duties to require the approval of the Governor, Executive Council, or Legislature to prosecute any action or proceeding, including signing onto or authoring amicus briefs or letters of support, in any court or tribunal other than an Iowa state court.” The bill passed by vote 32-18. [Iowa State Legislature, SF 615, 4/15/19]

Miller-Meeks Voted Along Party Lines To Prohibit The Democrat Attorney General From Joining Lawsuits That Targeted Trump Administration. “Iowa Republicans have proposed new restrictions on the state’s Democratic attorney general to prevent him from joining lawsuits that target President Donald Trump’s administration. Tom Miller, as the state’s chief legal officer, joined six lawsuits in 2018 that were initiated in other states seeking to block many of Trump’s policies, including separating families on the southern U.S. border and requiring citizenship information in the 2020 census […] ‘We have a Republican governor, we have a Republican Legislature, and we have had an attorney general that has been going outside of the state taking part in lawsuits that are the complete antithesis to the agenda that the governor and the Legislature has set,’ said Rep. Gary Worthan, R-Storm Lake. Worthan filed his proposal this week, tacking it onto a budget bill moving through the Iowa House of Representatives, that would require Miller’s office to get permission to join out-of-state lawsuits. If the proposal becomes law, the attorney general could only prosecute non-Iowa suits if requested by the governor, the General Assembly or the Executive Council, which also includes the governor.” [Des Moines Register, 4/20/19; S.F. 615, Journal of the Senate, 4/15/19]

- “Miller Joins Multistate Lawsuit Challenging Trump Administration’s Family Separation Policy” [Iowa Attorney General, 6/26/18]

- “Miller Joins Multistate Lawsuit Challenging Federal Rescinding of DACA Program” [Iowa Attorney General, 9/6/17]

- “Iowa Joins Multistate Lawsuit Against U.S. Department Of Education For Refusing To Enforce Gainful Employment Rule” [Iowa Attorney General, 10/16/17]
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- “Miller Joins Lawsuit To Block Census Bureau From Demanding Citizenship Information” [Iowa Attorney General, 4/3/18]

- “Attorney General Miller Joins 27-Member Coalition Defending Clean Power Plan” [Iowa Attorney General, 4/27/18]

- “Miller Joins 15 Attorneys General In Amicus Brief Supporting Washington State Lawsuit Against President Trump’s Executive Order On Immigration” [Iowa Attorney General, 2/6/17]

- “Miller, 17 Attorneys General Oppose Rolling Back Protections For Nursing Home Residents” [Iowa Attorney General, 5/31/18]

- “Miller Joins Coalition Asking Supreme Court To Review ACA Repeal Case” [Iowa Attorney General, 1/3/20]

2016 Election

2016: Miller-Meeks Said She Would Support Trump If Republicans Nominated Him, But Was Concerned About His Effect On Down Ballot Races

Miller-Meeks said once Trump was nominated by Republicans she would support him, but acknowledge that concerns about Trump’s effect on down ballot races was legitimate. “This summer, Ottumwa eye doctor, Mariannette Miller-Meeks will be a voting delegate to the National Convention. However, she isn’t sure how she will vote at the convention. In an email to KTVO, Miller-Meeks said that she isn’t quite clear on convention balloting protocol. She isn’t sure at this time if the rules will require her to cast a vote for Ted Cruz as the winner of the Iowa Caucus. But once the Trump is officially nominated by the party, he will have Miller-Meeks’s full support. ‘I think the party will get behind the nominee and focus on winning the White House in November. True rhetoric will change from ‘anyone but Trump’ to ‘anyone but Hillary’ or ‘#neverHillary,’ she said. She did acknowledge that concerns about Trump’s effect on down ballot races is legitimate. [KTVO, 5/4/16]

Miller-Meeks said “Comments Made By Trump 11 Years Ago Were Vulgar & Disgusting!”

According to Miller-Meeks twitter account, Miller-Meeks tweeted “Let me be clear, I think comments made by Trump 11 years ago were vulgar & disgusting! Also, actions of Bill & Hillary Clinton revolting!” [Dr. Miller-Meeks Twitter, 10/8/16]
HEADLINE: “Trump Recorded Having Extremely Lewd Conversation About Women In 2005.”
[Washington Post, 10/8/16]

Miller-Meeks Stated That Both Trump And Hillary Clinton Were “Liars & Corrupt”

NOTE: Miller-Meeks tweets are located on the DCCC’s Research Drive.

Miller-Meeks Stated That Both Trump And Hillary Clinton Were “Liars & Corrupt.” According to Miller-Meeks twitter account, Miller-Meeks tweeted a Daily Caller article titled “Hillary Clinton Is Unfit To Be President”, which twitter user Kenton Cole replied “do you believe Trump is fit to be President?” which Miller-Meeks responded “as fit as Hillary Clinton. Both liars & corrupt. He did it legally, she broke laws, used government position & hurt national sec.” Kenton Cole replied “so you are ok with the way he talks about women, wow...” which Miller-Meeks responded “Wow u support someone who knowingly breaks law & thinks they’re above law, demeans women & got rich off backs of taxpayers.” Kenton Cole replied “no, I’m not supporting Trump.” [Dr. Miller-Meeks Twitter, 10/8/16]
Issues
## Abortion & Women’s Health Issues

### Significant Findings

- **December 2021:** Miller-Meeks tweeted she was “proud to stand for life” in front of the Supreme Court during oral argument on whether to overturn Roe v. Wade and uphold Mississippi’s 15-week abortion ban.
  - **July 2021:** Miller-Meeks joined an amicus brief urging the Supreme Court to overturn Roe v. Wade in the Mississippi 15-week abortion ban case.

- **September 2021:** Miller-Meeks voted against the Women’s Health Protection Act, which would codify Roe v. Wade.

- Miller-Meeks made multiple false claims about Roe v. Wade, saying the ruling permitted abortion on demand up to birth (though it allowed abortion bans post-viability) and that it was “only temporary” and “only until women have access to birth control.”

- Miller-Meeks flip-flopped on abortion, calling herself “pro-choice” as recently as 2018 but “100 percent pro-life” as of the 2020 Republican primary.
  - **May 2018:** Miller-Meeks said “I’m also Catholic, I am pro-choice, but it’s a very sensitive issue.”
  - Miller-Meeks said abortion discussions were best left to providers, doctors, and patients.
  - **May 2020:** Miller-Meeks said she “misspoke” when she called herself pro-choice in 2018, claiming “my record is 100 percent pro-life.”
  - May 2020: Miller-Meeks said she had misspoken when she called herself pro-choice in 2018.
  - Iowa City Press-Citizen: Miller-Meeks’ 2020 anti-abortion stance was “seemingly a shift from 2018.”
  - June 2020: Miller-Meeks’ primary opponent said his campaign got Miller-Meeks to “embrace a more pro-life position” which he considered “a win.”

- **2019:** Miller-Meeks voted for a state HHS appropriations bill that prohibited grant funding for Planned Parenthood.

- **June 2021:** Miller-Meeks voted against blocking consideration of a bill that would have made the Hyde Amendment permanent.
  - Miller-Meeks: “The Hyde Amendment is commonsense and popular. Taxpayers should not foot the bill for abortions.”

- **2020:** Miller-Meeks voted against the expressed wishes of her constituents to repeal Iowans’ right to abortion access.
Miller-Meeks said she was “lobbied heavily by constituents” to vote against the constitutional amendment but voted in favor of the amendment “because that’s what I believed in.”

2021: Miller-Meeks supported the “Born Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act,” a bill interfering with medical practice and legislating an extremely rare, already protected scenario.

2020-2021: Miller-Meeks received endorsements and at least $16,600 from anti-abortion groups.

2019: Miller-Meeks voted for authorizing birth control sales without a prescription.

May 2021: Miller-Meeks co-sponsored a bill expanding the constitutional “right to life” to fetuses.

2019: Miller-Meeks voted for SF 523, which defined the term “unborn person” as a fetus at any point and increased penalties for intentionally or accidentally terminating pregnancy.

Democrats called SF 523 “extreme and unconstitutional,” saying it would endanger common birth control methods including IUDs and prevent Iowans access to in vitro fertilization.

Miller-Meeks said she helped champion the passage of a bill that banned most abortions after a fetal heartbeat was detected, which was struck down in January 2019.

2020: Miller-Meeks voted for requiring a 24-hour waiting period prior to abortion.

October 2021: Miller-Meeks voted against reauthorizing the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act.

October 2021: Miller-Meeks voted for a bill expanding protections for breastfeeding workers.

### 2021: Miller-Meeks Supported Overturning Roe v. Wade

**Miller-Meeks Urged The Supreme Court To Overturn Roe v. Wade By Upholding Mississippi’s 15-Week Abortion Ban**

December 2021: Miller-Meeks Tweeted That She Was “Proud To Stand For Life” In Front Of The Supreme Court During Oral Argument On The Mississippi 15-Week Abortion Ban

**December 1, 2021: Miller-Meeks Tweeted “Proud To Stand For Life Today And Every Day! #ProLife #SCOTUS” From Outside The Supreme Court.** “Proud to stand for life today and every day! #ProLife #SCOTUS” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 12/1/21]
December 1, 2021: The Supreme Court Heard Oral Argument On The Mississippi 15-Week Abortion Ban, A Case With Which The Supreme Court Was Speculated To Overturn Roe V. Wade. “Conservative U.S. Supreme Court justices on Wednesday signaled a willingness to dramatically curtail abortion rights in America and perhaps overturn the landmark 1973 Roe v. Wade ruling that legalized the procedure nationwide as they indicated they would uphold a restrictive Republican-backed Mississippi law. The court, which has a 6-3 conservative majority, heard about two hours of oral arguments in the southern state’s bid to revive its ban on abortion starting at 15 weeks of pregnancy, a law blocked by lower courts. The liberal justices warned against ditching important and longstanding legal precedents like Roe and abandoning a right American women have come to rely upon. Jackson Women’s Health Organization, the only abortion clinic in Mississippi, challenged the law and has the support of Democratic President Joe Biden’s administration. A ruling is expected by the end of next June.” [AP, 12/1/21]

July 2021: Miller-Meeks Joined An Amicus Brief Urging The Supreme Court To Overturn Roe V. Wade In The Mississippi 15-Week Abortion Ban Case

Miller-Meeks Joined An Amicus Brief Urging The Supreme Court To Overturn Roe V. Wade In A Case Reviewing Mississippi’s Abortion Law. “The Mississippi congressional delegation and the House Pro-Life Caucus today led more than 200 members of Congress in filing an amicus brief supporting the State of Mississippi in Dobbs v. Jackson Women’s Health Organization and urging the U.S. Supreme Court to uphold Mississippi’s law protecting life. […] This fall, the Supreme Court will hear Dobbs v. Jackson Women’s Health to consider the question of whether all pre-viability prohibitions on elective abortions are unconstitutional. This case represents the most significant challenge to Roe v. Wade and the viability standard in Planned Parenthood v. Casey in a generation. The State of Mississippi filed its case with the Supreme Court on July 22, 2021. […] Mariannette J. Miller-Meeks (Iowa-02)” [Office Of Sen. Roger Wicker, Press Release, 7/29/21]

September 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Women’s Health Protection Act, Which Would Codify Roe V. Wade
Miller-Meeks voted against the “Passage of the bill that would statutorily establish that health care providers have a right to provide and patients have a right to receive abortion services, and it would prohibit certain restrictions related to abortion services. The bill would specify that rights established by the bill may not be restricted by certain requirements or limitations related to abortion services, including prohibitions on abortion prior to fetal viability, or after fetal viability, or if a provider determines that continuation of a pregnancy would pose a risk to a patient’s life or health; requirements that patients disclose reasons for seeking an abortion or make medically unnecessary in-person appointments; requirements that providers provide medically inaccurate information or perform specific medical tests or procedures in connection with the provision of abortion services; limitations on providers’ ability to prescribe drugs based on good-faith medical judgment, provide services via telemedicine or provide immediate services when a delay would pose a risk to a patient’s health; and requirements for facilities and personnel that would not apply to facilities providing medically comparable procedures. It would also prohibit requirements or limitations that are similar to those established by the bill or that impede access to abortion services and expressly or implicitly single out abortion services, providers or facilities. It would specify factors that courts may consider to determine whether a requirement or limitation impedes access to abortion services, including whether it interferes with providers’ ability to provide services; poses a risk to patients’ health; is likely to delay or deter patients in accessing services or necessitate in-person visits that would not otherwise be required; is likely to result in a decreased availability of services in a state or region; is likely to result in increased costs of providing or obtaining services; or imposes penalties that are not imposed on other health care providers for comparable conduct. It would require a party defending a requirement or limitation to establish that it significantly advances the safety of abortion services or patient health and that such goals cannot be advanced by a less restrictive alternative measure. It would authorize the Justice Department, health care providers and private individuals and entities to bring a civil action in U.S. district court for injunctive relief against any state or government official charged with implementing or enforcing a requirement or limitation challenged as a violation of rights established by the bill. It would authorize district courts to award appropriate equitable relief, including temporary, preliminary or permanent injunctive relief, and to award costs of litigation to a prevailing plaintiff. It would require courts to ‘liberally construe’ provisions of the bill to effectuate its purposes.” The bill passed by a vote of 218-211. [CQ, 9/24/21; HR 3755, Vote 295, 9/24/21]

• **Washington Post: The Women’s Health Protection Act “Would Essentially Codify Roe V. Wade.”** “The House on Friday passed legislation that would create a statutory right for health-care professionals to provide abortions, amid an intensifying legal battle over a Texas law that is the most restrictive in the nation. H.R. 3755, the Women’s Health Protection Act, was approved by the House 218 to 211 but faces tough odds in the evenly divided Senate. The measure states that health-care providers have a statutory right to provide, and patients have a right to receive, abortion services without any number of limitations that states and opponents of the procedure have sought to impose. The measure would essentially codify Roe v. Wade, the 1973 Supreme Court decision guaranteeing the right to abortion before viability, usually around 22 to 24 weeks.” [Washington Post, 9/24/21]

• **Passage Of The WHPA Was In Response To A Restrictive Texas Abortion Law.** “Passage of the Women’s Health Protection Act is a response to a Texas law that essentially bans abortion after six weeks, before most people realize they are pregnant. The U.S. Supreme Court refused to block the law from taking effect, although the decision leaves the door open for future challenges.” [NPR, 9/24/21]

• **Pelosi: “This Ban Necessitates Codifying Roe V. Wade.”** “In a statement, Pelosi said the Texas statute is ‘the most extreme, dangerous abortion ban in half a century, and its purpose is to destroy Roe v. Wade, and even refuses to make exceptions for cases of rape and incest. This ban necessitates codifying Roe v. Wade.’” [NPR, 9/24/21]

Miller-Meeks Falsely Claimed Roe V. Wade Permitted Abortion On Demand Up To Birth

Miller-Meeks And Susan B. Anthony List President Marjorie Dannenfelser Op-Ed: Roe V. Wade
“Permit[ted] Abortion On Demand Up To Birth.” “Many Americans are horrified when they learn that Roe v. Wade permits abortion on demand up to birth – instead, laws must restrict the practice. Indeed, the U.S. is one of only seven nations that permit late-term abortions for any reason more than halfway through pregnancy, a shameful group that includes North Korea and China.” [Des Moines Register, Marjorie Dannenfelser And Mariannette Miller-Meeks Op-Ed, 6/4/21]

Roe v. Wade Allowed States To Ban Abortion After The Point Of Fetal Viability, Prevented Abortion Bans Before Viability. “In 1973, in Roe v. Wade, the Supreme Court drew a line. The Constitution, it said, did not allow states to ban abortions before the fetus could survive outside the womb. On Wednesday, when the court hears the most important abortion case in a generation, a central question will be whether the court’s conservative majority is prepared to erase that line. The case concerns a Mississippi law that bans most abortions after 15 weeks, long before fetal viability. The court could overrule Roe entirely, allowing states to ban abortions at any point. But at least some justices may want to find a way to sustain the Mississippi law without overturning Roe in so many words, requiring them to discard the viability line and replace it with another standard that would allow a cutoff at 15 weeks.” [New York Times, 11/28/21]

Roe v. Wade Allowed States To Prohibit Abortion After The Point Of Fetal Viability, With Only Limited Exceptions. “In its landmark 1973 abortion cases, the U.S. Supreme Court recognized a constitutional right to abortion but held that states could prohibit abortion after fetal viability—the point at which a fetus can sustain life outside the uterus—if their policies met certain requirements. Since then, the Supreme Court has consistently reaffirmed the fundamental right to abortion while also allowing new limits on an individual’s ability to obtain one. However, after President Trump appointed three conservative justices, the Court now has an anti-abortion majority. The current U.S. Supreme Court standard holds that states may prohibit abortion after fetal viability as long as there are exceptions for the life and health (both physical and mental) of the pregnant person.” [Guttmacher Institute, updated 12/1/21]

2020: Miller-Meeks Said Roe V. Wade Was “Only Temporary” And “Only Until Women Have Access To Birth Control”

Miller-Meeks Said Roe V. Wade Was “Only Temporary. This Is Only Until Women Have Access To Birth Control.” “In 1973 as I had mentioned to you all last session I had left home at 16 to find a way to put myself through college and medical school. So in 1973 when Roe v. Wade was decided, at that time in Texas what we said was ‘this is only temporary. This is only until women have access to birth control.’” [Iowa State Senate Floor, 2/13/20] (VIDEO) 00:00:00

September 2020: Miller-Meeks Said That If Roe V. Wade Were Overturned, Power Would Go Back To The States. “President Donald Trump is working to replace the late Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg. Conservatives hope another conservative on the bench could ultimately lead the court to overturn the 1973 Roe vs. Wade historic case that legalized a woman’s right to abortion. Thursday night the two candidates had to answer what would happen if the court does overturn that case. ‘That’s going to be an interesting time when that happens. I think that this is an issue that we’ve been talking about for 40 years. It’s unfortunate that we’re still having this conversation when we know that women have a right to privacy,’ said Hart. ‘I’m pro-life, I’ve been pro-life. I’ve had exceptions for rape, incest, and the physical life of the mother. I still have that stand. That’s my viewpoint. I think if Roe vs. Wade is overturned, then it goes back to the states,’ Miller-Meeks stated.” [WHO 13 Des Moines, 9/25/20]

2018-2020: Miller-Meeks Flip-Flopped On Abortion

May 2018: Miller-Meeks Said “I’m Also Catholic, I Am Pro-Choice, But It’s A Very Sensitive Issue”
Miller-Meeks: “It’s Difficult As A Woman To Face This Issue. I’m Also Catholic, I Am Pro-Choice, But It’s A Very Sensitive Issue”

Miller-Meeks: “It’s Difficult As A Woman To Face This Issue. I’m Also Catholic, I Am Pro-Choice, But It’s A Very Sensitive Issue.” At a forum hosted by Ottumwa Women’s League of Voter, Miller-Meeks said “It’s difficult as a woman to face this issue. I’m also Catholic, I am pro-choice, but it’s a very sensitive issue.” [Ottumwa League Of Women Voters, 5/31/18] (VIDEO) 00:00:43

Miller-Meeks Said Abortion Discussions Were Best Left To Providers, Doctors, And Patients

Miller-Meeks Said Abortion Discussions Were Best Left To Providers, Doctors, And Patients. At a forum hosted by Ottumwa Women’s League of Voter, Miller-Meeks said “I think these are decisions that are best left to providers, to doctors and to patients. I don’t want the government in my health care decisions. And I think that that’s why it’s a good thing to bring it up and to be challenged. But it is a very personal issue.” [Ottumwa League Of Women Voters, 5/31/18] (VIDEO) 00:01:21

May 2020: Miller-Meeks Said She “Misspoke” When She Called Herself Pro-Choice In 2018, Claiming “My Record Is 100 Percent Pro-Life”

May 2020: Miller-Meeks Said She Had Misspoken When She Called Herself Pro-Choice In 2018

May 2020: Miller-Meeks Said She “Misspoke” When She Called Herself Pro-Choice In 2018, Claiming “My Record Is 100 Percent Pro-Life.” “When challenged by Schilling on her stance on abortion, Miller-Meeks said she ‘misspoke’ in 2018 when she said she was pro-choice. ‘I have always been pro-life; my stance has been the same,’ she said. ‘I misspoke. It’s regrettable because it allows an avenue for people to be confused about my position. But my voting record is quite clear; we had a vote on a pro-life amendment in 2019 and 2020. I was the only woman to stand up and speak in favor of that bill. My record is 100 percent pro-life.’” [Muscatine Journal, 5/27/20]

May 2020: Miller-Meeks Said She Had A “100% Pro-Life Voting Record”

May 2020: Miller-Meeks Said She Had A “100% Pro-Life Voting Record.” “Now Miller-Meeks is ‘the only reliable pro-Trump conservative’ with a ‘100% pro-life voting record,’ she says. Schilling disputes that, backed by video clips and social media posts. The Schilling campaign released a screenshot from Miller-Meeks’ Twitter where she calls both Trump and Clinton ‘liars & corrupt.’ She was right, of course, but has since backtracked. Schilling also is promoting a video published by the Press-Citizen, in which Miller-Meeks in 2018 called herself ‘pro-choice.’ ‘I don’t want the government in my health care decisions,’ Miller-Meeks said in the video, recorded at an Ottumwa League of Women Voters forum. Again, she took the correct position in my view, but later said she misspoke.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, Adam Sullivan Column, 5/31/20]

May 2020: Miller-Meeks’ Campaign Spokesperson Claimed Miller-Meeks Had Misspoken When She Called Herself Pro-Choice In 2018

Miller-Meeks’ Campaign Spokesperson Said Miller-Meeks Having The Thought That “Some Notable Catholic Elected Leaders Are Pro-Choice” Had “Prompted Her To Misspeak.” “Her campaign spokesman, Eric Woolson, last week said Miller-Meeks simply misspoke at that event two years ago. ‘Senator Miller-Meeks was speaking to the point that she is a pro-life Catholic when it came to her mind that some notable Catholic elected leaders are pro-choice. That prompted her to misspeak,’ Woolson said. ‘As a physician, she was emphasizing her belief that, regardless of the medical condition being discussed, doctor-patient conversations need to be private and free of government intervention. All doctor-patient dialogue is, and should remain, private.’” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 5/2/20]
Miller-Meeks’ Campaign Spokesperson Said Miller-Meeks Had Been Emphasizing That “Doctor-Patient Conversations Need To Be Private And Free Of Government Intervention.” “That prompted her to misspeak ‘Her campaign spokesman, Eric Woolson, last week said Miller-Meeks simply misspoke at that event two years ago. […] ‘As a physician, she was emphasizing her belief that, regardless of the medical condition being discussed, doctor-patient conversations need to be private and free of government intervention. All doctor-patient dialogue is, and should remain, private.’” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 5/2/20]

Iowa City Press-Citizen: Miller-Meeks’ 2020 Anti-Abortion Stance Was “Seemingly A Shift From 2018”

“Iowa City Press-Citizen: Miller-Meeks’ 2020 Anti-Abortion Stance Was “Seemingly A Shift From 2018.” “State Sen. Mariannette Miller-Meeks of Ottumwa has run her 2020 campaign for Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District as an anti-abortion candidate, seemingly a shift from 2018, when she characterized her views as ‘pro-choice’ and said a person’s choice to get an abortion is ‘best left to doctors, to providers and to patients.’” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 5/2/20]

May 2020: Cedar Rapids Gazette Columnist Adam Sullivan Questioned Whether Miller-Meeks Was Being Honest With Voters On Abortion

“Cedar Rapids Gazette Columnist Adam Sullivan On Miller-Meeks And Her Primary Opponent Bobby Schilling: “I Wonder If They’re Being Honest With Voters” On Abortion. “Abortion has been a top issue in the primary. It’s a peculiar thing for candidates to say they are ‘100 percent pro-Trump’ and also ‘100 percent pro-life,’ since Trump spent most of his life proudly supporting abortion rights. It’s not my position, but you would think a true anti-abortion champion would be committing to hold Trump accountable, not swearing blind allegiance. I don’t fault them for being moderates, either formerly or secretly. I certainly wouldn’t hold it against them if they held nuanced views about Trump and abortion rights. But I wonder if they’re being honest with voters. And I wonder what their race to the bottom says about the state of our Republican Party.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, Adam Sullivan Column, 5/31/20]

June 2020: Miller-Meeks’ Primary Opponent Said His Campaign Got Miller-Meeks To “Embrace A More Pro-Life Position” Which He Considered “A Win”


Iowa City Press-Citizen: The 2020 Republican Primary In Iowa’s 2nd District Was A Fight “Over Who The Most Anti-Abortion Candidate Was And Who The Bigger Supporter Of President Donald Trump Was.”

“The Republican primary was marked by a back-and-forth volley, as Miller-Meeks and Schilling fought over who the most anti-abortion candidate was and who the bigger supporter of President Donald Trump was. In a news conference before the results were counted, Miller-Meeks said that although it was a tough primary, it made her ‘battle-tested.’” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 6/3/20]

October 2020: In A Debate With Rita Hart, Miller-Meeks Did Not Say Whether She Favored Congress Legislating Abortion

“October 2020: In A Debate With Rita Hart, Miller-Meeks Did Not Say Whether She Favored Congress Legislating Abortion. “Candidates running for Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District found some common ground during a televised debate Thursday, but continued to spar over health care. Democrat Rita Hart and Republican
Mariannette Miller-Meeks met in Davenport for a debate hosted by the Quad-City Times and KWQC TV6. [...] On abortion, when asked if Roe v. Wade should be overturned by the U.S. Supreme Court, Hart, a farmer and 20-year teacher, said ‘we have got to make sure that women have a right to privacy and that they have a right to reproductive health care.’ Miller-Meeks did not say whether she favors Congress stepping in to avoid a national patchwork of abortion laws.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 10/15/20]

2008: Miller-Meeks Said There Was Nothing She Could Do To Stop Abortion, Was Accused By Her Primary Opponents Of Being Liberal In Her Views On Abortion

2008: Miller-Meeks Was Accused Of Being Liberal On Abortion By A Primary Opponent. “One Republican opponent accuses Miller-Meeks of being liberal in her views on abortion, but for Miller-Meeks it comes down to an issue of education. ‘I feel that people should have access to information, which includes abstinence and other means of birth control,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘Not every person is blessed to have a mom and a dad who are trying to help them to problem solve and resist peer pressure.’” [The Hawk Eye, 5/27/08]

2008: Miller-Meeks Said Abortion Was A Judicial Issue And There Was Nothing She Could Do To Stop Abortion As A Lawmaker. “Miller-Meeks said because it’s a judicial issue there is nothing she can do as a lawmaker to stop abortion, but she can make it easier to support families.” [The Hawk Eye, 5/27/08]

2020: Miller-Meeks Voted To Repeal Iowans’ Right To Choose, Despite Admitting Her Constituents Wanted Her To Preserve That Right

2020: Miller-Meeks Voted For Amending The State Constitution To Repeal The Right To Abortion, Though A Majority Of Iowans Believed Abortion Should Be Legal In All Or Most Cases

2020: Miller-Meeks Voted For Amending The State Constitution To Repeal The Right To Abortion. Miller-Meeks voted for SJR 2001, “a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the State of Iowa to protect life by declaring that the Constitution of the State of Iowa shall not be construed to recognize, grant, or secure a right to abortion or to require the public funding of abortion.” The bill passed by vote 32-18. [Iowa State Legislature, SJR 2001, 2/13/20]

- 2021: 57% Of Iowans Said Abortion Should Be Legal In All Or Most Cases. A majority of Iowans say abortion should be legal, an 8 percentage point increase since 2020, a new Des Moines Register/Mediacom Iowa Poll shows. Fifty-seven percent of Iowans say abortion should be legal in most or all cases, while 38% say abortion should be illegal in most or all cases, and 5% aren't sure. The last time the question was asked, in a March 2020 Iowa Poll, 49% said abortion should be legal in all or most cases and 45% said it should be illegal in all or most cases. The latest poll of 805 Iowa adults was conducted Sept. 12-15 by Selzer & Co. It has a margin of error of plus or minus 3.5 percentage points. [Des Moines Register, 9/25/21]

Des Moines Register Called The Proposed Constitutional Amendment “An Attempt To Overturn A 2018 Iowa Supreme Court Decision That Protected Abortion Rights In The State.” “In Iowa's Legislature, Republican lawmakers have passed numerous abortion restrictions and are working to pass a constitutional amendment saying that the Iowa Constitution does not secure a right to abortion. It’s an attempt to overturn a 2018 Iowa Supreme Court decision that protected abortion rights in the state.” [Des Moines Register, 9/25/21]

Miller-Meeks Said She Was “Lobbied Heavily By Constituents” To Vote Against The Constitutional Amendment But Voted In Favor Of The Amendment “Because That’s What I Believed In”

Miller-Meeks Said She Was “Lobbied Heavily By Constituents” To Vote Against The Constitutional Amendment But Voted In Favor Of The Amendment “Because That's What I Believed In.” At a Marion
County GOP Congressional Forum, Miller-Meeks said “Well I think you’re there- the party, and we’ve talked about the party platform earlier, represents a set of values. So within those set of values you vote in accordance with them. You are also there to represent your district, but I would disagree in saying that you vote purely by your district. And I’ll give you an example. I’m in a Democrat senate district. When we passed the constitutional amendment, the life amendment, to the constitution and I spoke on the floor about the amendment, I was lobbied heavily by constituents in my district to vote against it. I had many more people contact me to vote against it than to vote for it. So if I had gone along with my district I would have voted against it but I voted for it because that’s what I believed in. So it would not have mattered what my party wanted, and I voted against my district because I’m in a Democrat district, but I voted my value system and beliefs. So I think as much as you can you’re trying to do it within your beliefs and values system and in accordance with what you have been elected to represent with your platform and your party.” [Marion County GOP Congressional Forum, 00:43:00, 5/14/20] (VIDEO)

- **Miller-Meeks’ Statement Was In Response To The Question Of Whether She Would Work For The GOP Or The Citizens Of Iowa’s 2nd District In DC.** At a Marion County GOP Congressional Forum, Miller-Meeks was asked “I believe that most of the people that have been elected to go to Washington vote mainly party. Both Pelosi and McCarthy have the uncanny ability to whip their members into line. And so we very rarely see disagreements from within the party. I believe that it’s the candidates responsibility to represent the people of the district are elected to and not just represent the party. We need to work with the people of our district and represent what they want us to do.” [Marion County GOP Congressional Forum, 00:41:00, 5/14/20] (VIDEO)

---

### Planned Parenthood

#### 2019: Miller-Meeks Voted To Defund Planned Parenthood

**2019: Miller-Meeks Voted For HF 766, The Health And Human Services Appropriation Bill.** Miller-Meeks voted for HF 766, “A bill for an act relating to appropriations for health and human services and veterans and including other related provisions and appropriations, providing penalties, and including effective date and retroactive and other applicability date provisions.” The bill passed 31-17. [Iowa State Legislature, HF 766, 4/27/19]

- **HF 766 Prohibited Grant Funding For Any Sex Education Program Administered By An Organization That “Performs Or Promotes Abortions.”** “Any contract entered into on or after July 1, 2019, by the department of public health to administer the personal responsibility education program as specified in 42 U.S.C. §713 or to administer the sexual risk avoidance education grant program authorized pursuant to section 510 of Tit. v of the federal Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. §710, as amended by section 50502 of the federal Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018, Pub. L. No. 115-123, and as further amended by division S, Title VII, section 701 of the federal Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2018, Pub. L. No. 115-141, shall exclude as an eligible applicant, any applicant entity that performs abortions, promotes abortions, maintains or operates a facility where abortions are performed or promoted, contracts or subcontracts with an entity that performs or promotes abortions, becomes or continues to be an affiliate of any entity that performs or promotes abortions, or regularly makes referrals to an entity that provides or promotes abortions or maintains or operates a facility where abortions are performed.” [Iowa State Legislature, HF 766 Sec. 99-100, 4/27/19]

- **HF 766 Prohibited Grant Funding For Planned Parenthood And Banned Medicaid From Covering Transition-Related Health Care In Iowa.** “On Saturday, the Iowa House passed HF 766 (the Health and Human Services budget bill). The bill bans Medicaid and all other insurance coverage funded by public dollars from paying for transition-related medical services for transgender Iowans. The bill also prevents Planned Parenthood and other entities that provide abortion services from engaging in competitive bidding for certain sexual education federal grants. The Iowa Senate passed the bill less than 24 hours earlier.” [WHO 13 Des Moines, 4/27/19]
• Iowa City Press-Citizen: Miller-Meeks Voted “To Defund Planned Parenthood In The 2019 Health And Human Services Budget.” “Woolson said Miller-Meeks' record demonstrates her stance on abortion. She supported an anti-abortion amendment to the Iowa Constitution, as well as a vote to defund Planned Parenthood in the 2019 Health and Human Services budget.” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 5/2/20]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012: Miller-Meeks Tweeted That Planned Parenthood Was Synonymous With Abortion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012: Miller-Meeks Said Then-VP Biden “Subconsciously Admitted That Abortion And Planned Parenthood = Synonymous.” “He did say that...RT @scrowder : YES! Biden just subconsciously admitted that Abortion and Planned Parenthood = Synonymous! #VPDebate” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 10/11/12]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hyde Amendment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>June 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Blocking Consideration Of A Bill That Would Have Made The Hyde Amendment Permanent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 2021: Miller-Meeks Co-Sponsored And Voted Against Blocking Consideration Of HR 18, The No Taxpayer Funding For Abortion And Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act Of 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| June 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Blocking Consideration Of The No Taxpayer Funding For Abortion And Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act Of 2021. In June 2021, Miller-Meeks Voted Against: “Agreeing to the Morelle, D-N.Y., motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and possibility of amendment).” According to the Congressional Record, Rep. Burgess said, “If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to immediately consider H.R. 18, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act of 2021.” A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of the bill. The motion was agreed to, 218-209. [H Res 486, Vote #175, 6/23/21; CQ, 6/23/21; Congressional Record, 6/23/21] |

| June 2021: Miller-Meeks Signed On To Co-Sponsor The No Taxpayer Funding For Abortion And Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act Of 2021. [HR 18, Introduced 2/5/21, Cosponsored 6/8/21] |

**HR 18 Would Have Made The Hyde Amendment, Which Prohibited Federal Funding For Abortions Or Health Coverage That Included Abortion, Permanent**

The No Taxpayer Funding For Abortion And Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act Of 2021 Would Have Made The Hyde Amendment Permanent. “H.R. 18 — the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act of 2021 — would make the long-standing Hyde Amendment permanent and keep in place similar provisions to ensure no federal dollars are used to pay for abortion and health plans that include abortion.” [Catholic News Service, 2/10/21]  

The Hyde Amendment Ensured That No Federal Dollars Were Used To Pay For Abortion And Health Plans That Include Abortion. “H.R. 18 — the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act of 2021 — would make the long-standing Hyde Amendment permanent and keep in place similar provisions to ensure no federal dollars are used to pay for abortion and health plans that include abortion.” [Catholic News Service, 2/10/21]  

The Bill Prohibited The Use Of Federal Funds For Abortions Or Health Coverage That Includes Abortions And Prohibited Qualified Health Plans From Including Coverage For Abortions. “This bill modifies provisions relating to federal funding for, and health insurance coverage of, abortions. Specifically, the bill prohibits the use of federal funds for abortions or for health coverage that includes abortions. Such restrictions extend to the use of funds in the budget of the District of Columbia. Additionally, abortions may not be provided in a federal health care facility or by a federal employee. […] The bill also prohibits qualified health plans from
including coverage for abortions. Currently, qualified health plans may cover abortion, but the portion of the premium attributable to abortion coverage is not eligible for subsidies.” [Congressional Research Service, 2/5/21]

Miller-Meeks: The Hyde Amendment “Save[d] Countless Lives”

Miller-Meeks: The Hyde Amendment “Save[d] Countless Lives.” “Since 1976, we have seen the #HydeAmendment save countless lives. This amendment has had strong, bipartisan, and bicameral support in Congress for decades. I am proud to support the Hyde Amendment because #HydeSavesLives. #IA02” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 9/8/21]

Miller-Meeks: “The Hyde Amendment Is Commonsense And Popular. Taxpayers Should Not Foot The Bill For Abortions”

Miller-Meeks: “The Hyde Amendment Is Commonsense And Popular. Taxpayers Should Not Foot The Bill For Abortions.” “The Hyde Amendment is commonsense and popular. Taxpayers should not foot the bill for abortions. #HydeSavesLives” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 7/28/21]

“Born-Alive” Act

2021: Miller-Meeks Supported The “Born Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act,” A Bill Interfering With Medical Practice And Legislating An Extremely Rare, Already Protected Scenario

April 2021: Miller-Meeks Said She Was “Proud To Sign On To Cosponsor” The Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. “Proud to sign on to cosponsor and sign the discharge petition in support of @RepAnnWagner, @SteveScalise, and @RepKatCammack's Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. #IA02” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 4/16/21]

June 2021: Miller-Meeks Wrote An Op-Ed With Susan B. Anthony List President Marjorie Dannenfelser Supporting The Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. “Our government's most sacred duty is to safeguard the right to life for all Americans, including the most vulnerable. That's why pro-life leaders in Congress are demanding a vote on the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act to ensure that every newborn baby receives equal care, no matter the circumstances of their birth. The effort is bitterly partisan - for now. It would take only five House Democrats joining the Republicans' petition to force a vote on this bill. Five Democrats - not to guarantee passage, just to simply have a vote. Every Republican member of Iowa's congressional delegation supports this bill, both in the House and Senate.” [Des Moines Register, Marjorie Dannenfelser And Mariannette Miller-Meeks Op-Ed, 6/4/21]

Vox: Critics Of The Born-Alive Act Noted That “A Live Birth After An Abortion Attempt Is An Extremely Unlikely Scenario” And That “Laws Already Exist To Protect An Infant In This Instance Anyway.” “The Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, sponsored by Sen. Ben Sasse (R-NE), failed in the Senate last year. But now Sasse is bringing back the legislation, and it’s part of a bigger debate about abortions very late in pregnancy that is intensifying in the runup to the election this year. […] But reproductive rights and physician groups say the bill could criminalize doctors and is unnecessary — not only because a live birth after an abortion attempt is an extremely unlikely scenario but also because laws already exist to protect an infant in this instance anyway. ‘The bill maligns and vilifies providers and patients to push a false narrative about abortion later in pregnancy,’ Dr. Kristyn Brandi, a board member of Physicians for Reproductive Health, told Vox in an email last year.” [Vox, 2/11/20]

Sen. Ben Sasse (R-NE), failed in the Senate last year. But now Sasse is bringing back the legislation, and it’s part of a bigger debate about abortions very late in pregnancy that is intensifying in the run-up to the election this year. […] When the earlier version of the bill was proposed in 2017, the head of the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists called it a ‘gross legislative interference into the practice of medicine, putting politicians between women and their trusted doctors,’ according to Rewire News.” [Vox, 2/11/20]

**Campaign Finance & National Endorsements**

### 2020-2021: Miller-Meeks Received $16,600 From Anti-Abortion Groups

### 2020-2021: Miller-Meeks Received $11,600 From Susan B. Anthony List Candidate Fund. [FEC Committee Candidate and Committee Viewer, accessed 12/10/21]

### 2020: Miller-Meeks Received $5,000 From National Pro-Life Alliance PAC. [FEC Committee Candidate and Committee Viewer, accessed 12/10/21]

### 2020: National Right To Life Endorsed Miller-Meeks

2020: National Right To Life Endorsed Miller-Meeks. “A record 55 Republican women, the vast majority of whom are pro-life, have won House primaries this year according to the Center for American Women in Politics at Rutgers. The full list of endorsed candidates by National Right to Life may be found here: www.nrlvictoryfund.org/endorsements/. Some standout races include the following: […] Pro-life state Senator Mariannette Miller-Meeks is facing fellow state Senator Rita Hart in an open seat in a district that President Trump won in 2016. With backgrounds in military service and the medical field, Miller-Meeks is uniquely qualified to stand up for unborn children and their mothers in the U.S. House. Rita Hart supports a policy of abortion on demand, which would allow abortion for reason. She is backed by pro-abortion groups such as EMILY’s List and Planned Parenthood that support abortion any time, anywhere and for any reason.” [National Right To Life News, 9/1/20]

**Contraception**

### 2020: Miller-Meeks Said Roe V. Wade Was “Only Temporary” And “Only Until Women Have Access To Birth Control”

Miller-Meeks Said Roe V. Wade Was “Only Temporary. This Is Only Until Women Have Access To Birth Control.” “In 1973 as I had mentioned to you all last session I had left home at 16 to find a way to put myself through college and medical school. So in 1973 when Roe v. Wade was decided, at that time in Texas what we said was ‘this is only temporary. This is only until women have access to birth control.’” [Iowa State Senate Floor, 2/13/20] (VIDEO) 00:00:00

### 2019: Miller-Meeks Voted For Authorizing Birth Control Sales Without A Prescription


Miller-Meeks: “Young Women Have Available Resources, Both For Birth Control And The Educational Wherewithal To Be Able To Prevent Pregnancy.” At a forum hosted by Ottumwa Women’s League of Voter,
Miller-Meeks said “When I talk to people I can tell you, women may support it or not supported but they don’t think that abortion should be used as birth control. We need to continue to educate. We need to make sure that young women have available resources, both for birth control and the educational wherewithal to be able to prevent pregnancy.” [Ottumwa League Of Women Voters, 5/31/18] (VIDEO) 00:01:34

**2008: Miller-Meeks Said It Was Important To Give People Access To Information, Including “Abstinence And Other Means Of Birth Control”**

Miller-Meeks said it was important to give people access to information, including “abstinence and other means of birth control.” One Republican opponent accuses Miller-Meeks of being liberal in her views on abortion, but for Miller-Meeks it comes down to an issue of education. ‘I feel that people should have access to information, which includes abstinence and other means of birth control,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘Not every person is blessed to have a mom and a dad who are trying to help them to problem solve and resist peer pressure.’ Miller-Meeks said because it’s a judicial issue there is nothing she can do as a lawmaker to stop abortion, but she can make it easier to support families.” [The Hawk Eye, 5/27/08]

**Exceptions To Abortion Restrictions**

**2010: Miller-Meeks Said She Did Believe “There Must Be Reasonable Exceptions For Victims Of Rape And Incest, Or When The Physical Life Of The Mother Is At Stake”**

2010: Miller-Meeks said she did believe “there must be reasonable exceptions for victims of rape and incest, or when the physical life of the mother is at stake.” According to Miller-Meeks for Congress 2010 website under “Traditional Iowa Values”, Miller-Meeks wrote “I am pro-life on the issue of abortion but do believe there must be reasonable exceptions for victims of rape and incest, or when the physical life of the mother is at stake. I also support traditional marriage.” [Miller-Meeks for Congress 2010, accessed 6/15/20]

**Fetal Personhood**

**May 2021: Miller-Meeks Co-Sponsored A Bill Expanding The Constitutional “Right To Life” To Fetuses**

May 2021: Miller-Meeks co-sponsored HR 1011, the Life At Conception Act, which “declares that the right to life guaranteed by the Constitution is vested in each human being at all stages of life, including the moment of fertilization, cloning, or other moment at which an individual comes into being. Nothing in this bill shall be construed to authorize the prosecution of any woman for the death of her unborn child.” The bill was read twice and referred to House Judiciary. [HR 1011, Co-sponsored, 5/14/21; CQ, 3/18/21]

**2019: Miller-Meeks Voted For SF 523, Which Defined The Term “Unborn Person” As A Fetus At Any Point And Increased Penalties For Intentionally Or Accidentally Terminating Pregnancy**

2019: Miller-Meeks voted for SF 523, a bill expanding penalties for violating the constitutional “right to life” to fetuses. Miller-Meeks voted for SF 523, “a bill for an act relating to the nonconsensual cause of death of and serious injury to an unborn person, and providing penalties.” The bill passed 31-18. [Iowa State Legislature, SF 523, 3/26/19]

**SF 523 Increased The Penalty For “Intentionally Or Accidentally Causing The Death Of An ‘Unborn Person.’”** “A House subcommittee has advanced a bill (SF 523) that would increase the criminal penalty for intentionally or accidentally causing the death of an “unborn person.” It was the first opportunity for supporters and opponents of the proposal to weigh in on controversial language defining an unborn person as starting at
conception. Under the measure, some people convicted of killing an unborn person could receive a life sentence. Supporters said it is an appropriate punishment.” [Iowa Public Radio, 4/1/19]

SF 523 Defined “An Individual Organism Of The Species Homo Sapiens From Fertilization To Live Birth” To Be An “Unborn Person.” “The measure defines ‘unborn person’ to mean ‘an individual organism of the species homo sapiens from fertilization to live birth.’ Chapman said the measure would only strengthen penalties that exist in current law and is unrelated to abortion since it deals with pregnancies ended without the pregnant woman's consent.” [Des Moines Register, 3/26/19]

Democrats Called SF 523 “Extreme And Unconstitutional,” Saying It Would Endanger Common Birth Control Methods Including IUDs And Prevent Iowans Access To In Vitro Fertilization

Democrats Called The Bill “Extreme And Unconstitutional” Saying It Would Endanger Common Birth Control Methods Including IUDs And Prevent Iowans Access To In Vitro Fertilization. “Senate Democratic Leader Janet Petersen of Des Moines called the bill ’extreme and unconstitutional’ and said, if it becomes law, it would endanger common birth control procedures, including IUDs, and could prevent Iowans from using in vitro fertilization. It could also open the door for criminal investigations of women who suffer a miscarriage, Petersen said. The debate over the definition of ‘unborn person’ came during a Senate discussion of a measure that would increase penalties for ending a woman’s pregnancy without her consent, for example, by killing or injuring the woman in a car crash or while committing a felony and ending her pregnancy in the process.” [Des Moines Register, 3/26/19]

Heartbeat Bill

Miller-Meeks Said She Helped Champion The Passage Of A Bill That Banned Most Abortions After A Fetal Heartbeat Was Detected, Which Was Struck Down In January 2019

Miller-Meeks Said She Helped Champion The Passage Of A Bill That Banned Most Abortions After A Fetal Heartbeat Was Detected. “While the Democratic nomination process has been quiet, the Republican nomination is hotly contested between Miller-Meeks and LeClaire businessman Bobby Schilling. In a statement about Reynolds endorsement, Miller-Meeks said her legislative record ‘championed’ Reynolds’ priorities in the 2019 session. She referenced the passage of a bill that banned most abortions after a fetal heartbeat was detected which was struck down in January 2019. She also mentioned her work to pass a bill that set up a children’s mental health system in Iowa and a pro-gun rights resolution aiming to add a 2nd Amendment protections to the Iowa Constitution.” [Iowa City Press-Citizen. 11/8/19]

- January 2019: A District Court Judge Ruled The Fetal Heartbeat Bill Was Unconstitutional. “The 2018 forum topic was whether either Miller-Meeks or challenger Daniel Cesar would repeal the 2018 legislative bill banning most abortions after a fetal heartbeat is detected. At the time, the legislation was considered the most restrictive abortion ban in the nation; a district court judge ruled it unconstitutional in January 2019.” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 5/4/20]

Sex Ed

2008: Miller-Meeks Said She Felt It Was Important To Give People Access To Information About “Abstinence And Other Means Of Birth Control”

Miller-Meeks Said It Was Important To Give People Access To Information About “Abstinence And Other Means Of Birth Control.” “One Republican opponent accuses Miller-Meeks of being liberal in her views on abortion, but for Miller-Meeks it comes down to an issue of education. ‘I feel that people should have access to
Information, which includes abstinence and other means of birth control,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘Not every person is blessed to have a mom and a dad who are trying to help them to problem solve and resist peer pressure.’ Miller-Meeks said because it’s a judicial issue there is nothing she can do as a lawmaker to stop abortion, but she can make it easier to support families.” [The Hawk Eye, 5/27/08]

### Veterans

**June 2021: Miller-Meeks Joined A Letter Urging VA Secretary McDonough To Prohibit The VA From Providing Abortion Or Abortion Counseling**

June 2021: Miller-Meeks Joined A Letter Urging VA Secretary McDonough To Prohibit The VA From Providing Abortion Or Abortion Counseling. “Today, Rep. Mike Bost (R-Ill.), the Ranking Member of the House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, Rep. Matt Rosendale (R-Mont.), the Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Technology Modernization, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meek (R-Iowa), Rep. Chris Smith (R-NJ), and more than 130 Members of Congress, sent a letter to VA Secretary Denis McDonough, urging the Secretary to maintain the current laws which prohibit the Department of Veterans Affairs from offering abortions or providing abortion counsel. ‘The VA must never use taxpayer dollars to provide abortions or abortion counseling to veterans,’ the Members wrote. ‘To do so would be contrary to the God-given right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness that generations of veterans fought to defend.’” [House Committee On Veteran’s Affairs Republicans, Press Release, 6/16/21]

- The Letter Claimed Providing Abortion Services “Would Be Contrary To The God-Given Right To Life, Liberty, And The Pursuit Of Happiness That Generations Of Veterans Fought To Defend.” “Today, Rep. Mike Bost (R-Ill.), the Ranking Member of the House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, Rep. Matt Rosendale (R-Mont.), the Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Technology Modernization, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meek (R-Iowa), Rep. Chris Smith (R-NJ), and more than 130 Members of Congress, sent a letter to VA Secretary Denis McDonough, urging the Secretary to maintain the current laws which prohibit the Department of Veterans Affairs from offering abortions or providing abortion counsel. ‘The VA must never use taxpayer dollars to provide abortions or abortion counseling to veterans,’ the Members wrote. ‘To do so would be contrary to the God-given right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness that generations of veterans fought to defend.’” [House Committee On Veteran’s Affairs Republicans, Press Release, 6/16/21]

### Waiting Period

**2020: Miller-Meeks Voted For Requiring A 24-Hour Waiting Period Prior To Abortion**

2020: Miller-Meeks Voted For Requiring A 24-Hour Waiting Period Prior To Abortion. Meeks voted for S.F. 594, “a bill for an act relating to medical procedures including abortion and limitations regarding the withdrawal of a life sustaining procedure from a minor child.” The bill passed by vote 31-16. [Iowa State Legislature, S.F. 594, 6/14/20]

### Women’s Health

**October 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Reauthorizing The Family Violence Prevention And Services Act**

October 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Reauthorizing The Family Violence Prevention And Services Act. On October 26, 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against the “Passage of the bill, as amended, that would reauthorize and modify programs to address domestic, dating and family violence under the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act. It would authorize $328 million annually through fiscal 2026 for new and existing programs, including $26 million for grants to state coalitions to support local and culturally specific violence prevention
efforts; $14 million for the National Domestic Violence Hotline and $4 million for a new National Native American Domestic Violence Hotline; $10 million for new grants to organizations serving underserved populations; and $3.5 million for research and evaluation activities. Among other provisions, it would prohibit discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity in programs funded by state formula grants. It would require the Government Accountability Office to conduct a study and issue a report, within two years of enactment, on federal programs for violence survivors, including to analyze gaps in such programs and steps taken to ensure survivors have access to programs that support their financial stability.” The bill passed by a vote of 228 to 200. [H.R. 2119, Vote 336, 10/26/21; CQ, 10/26/21]

October 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted For A Bill Expanding Protections For Breastfeeding Workers

October 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted For A Bill To Expand Requirements For Employers To Provide Breaks For Employees To Pump Breast Milk And Allow Employees To Seek Restitution For Violations Of Such Requirements. On October 22, 2021, Miller-Meeks voted for the “Passage of the bill, as amended, that would expand requirements for employers to provide breaks for employees to pump breast milk and allow employees to seek restitution for violations of such requirements. Specifically, the bill would require all employers to provide reasonable breaks as needed and a private place other than a bathroom for employees to express breast milk for a period of two years after such need arises. It would specify that employers would not be required to compensate employees for break time provided unless otherwise required by federal, state or local law. It would specify that break time would be considered hours worked if the employee is not completely relieved from duty during the entirety of the break. It would establish an effective date of 120 days after enactment and require the Labor Department, within 60 days of enactment, to issue guidance with respect to employer compliance. In seeking legal remedy against an employer that does not comply with the bill’s requirements, it would generally require the employee to inform the employer and give them 10 days to provide accommodations prior to commencing legal action. It would provide an undue hardship exemption for employers of fewer than 50 employees. For air carriers, it would establish a separate effective date of one year after enactment; specify that accommodations would not have to completely relieve crewmembers from duty during in-flight breaks or provide breaks during critical phases of flight; and require the Federal Aviation Administration to propose regulations identifying appropriate means for air carrier compliance and updating federal law to ensure that expressing breast milk is considered a ‘physiological need.’” The bill passed by a vote of 276-149. [H.R. 3110, Vote 331, 10/22/21; CQ, 10/22/21]

• October 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted For A Motion To Recommit The PUMP For Nursing Mothers Act To Expand Employer Requirements For Breastfeeding Accommodations. On October 22, 2021, Miller-Meeks voted for the “Van Duyne, R-Texas, motion to recommit the bill to the House Education and Labor Committee.” The motion was rejected by a vote of 200-224. [H.R. 3110, Vote 330, 10/22/21; CQ, 10/22/21]
Agriculture & Food Access Issues

**Significant Findings**

✓ 2008: Miller-Meeks said “farmers want to have a free market in which to trade. They don’t want subsidies; that’s what they’ve told me.”

✓ 2019-2020: Miller-Meeks voted 3 times in the Iowa Senate to tighten eligibility requirements for SNAP.
  ✓ March 2020: Miller-Meeks voted for SF 2366, which would establish work requirements for access to SNAP.
  ✓ February 2020: Miller-Meeks voted for SF 2272, a bill requiring enhanced eligibility verification measures for SNAP.
  ✓ April 2019: Miller-Meeks voted for SF 334, a bill requiring enhanced eligibility verification measures for SNAP.

✓ 2014: Miller-Meeks refused to say whether SNAP should be separated from the farm bill.

✓ 2014: Miller-Meeks falsely claimed that the top item purchased with food stamps was Mountain Dew.
  ✓ Miller-Meeks later apologized for the misstatement and acknowledged the state does not specifically track food stamp purchase information.

✓ 2010: Miller-Meeks criticized a funding bill for taking money away from food stamps, about which she said “every $1 million spent in the program generates or saves 10 Iowa jobs.”

✓ 2021: Miller-Meeks repeatedly called on Biden to raise renewable fuel standard volumes, which she called “good for American consumers, farmers, and the environment.”

✓ 2021: Miller-Meeks said she supported Rep. Randy Feenstra’s amendment to the American Rescue Plan providing economic relief to farmers following natural disasters in 2020.

✓ 2021: Miller-Meeks called WHIP+, a relief program for producers facing losses from 2018 and 2019 natural disasters, “a vital resource for farmers and producers in Iowa.”

✓ October 2021: Miller-Meeks defended JBS’ handling of the COVID-19 outbreak at its Ottumwa plant, saying the majority of cases in workers originated outside of the plant itself.

✓ June 2021: Miller-Meeks introduced a bill to tackle anticompetitive practices in the meat and poultry industries, calling the practices a threat to the food supply and national security.

✓ 2019: Miller-Meeks voted to criminalize trespassing on agricultural and animal food production facilities.

✓
2008: Miller-Meeks Said “Farmers Want To Have A Free Market In Which To Trade. They Don’t Want Subsidies; That’s What They’ve Told Me”

Miller-Meeks: “Farmers Want To Have A Free Market In Which To Trade. They Don’t Want Subsidies; That’s What They’ve Told Me.” The candidate is also for a free market economy, a revamp of the tax code and fewer subsidies. ‘Farmers want to have a free market in which to trade. They don’t want subsidies; that’s what they’ve told me,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘It may take the United States to be the leader and say we’re going to get rid of subsidies and you’ll follow suit.’” [The Hawk Eye, 5/27/08]

2014: Miller-Meeks Said Governmental Safety Nets “Need To Transform Safety Nets Into Trampolines So You Never Hit Bottom But You’re Boosted Upward So You Can Fulfill Whatever Potential You Have”

Miller-Meeks Said Governmental Safety Nets “Need To Transform Safety Nets Into Trampolines So You Never Hit Bottom But You’re Boosted Upward So You Can Fulfill Whatever Potential You Have.” “Miller-Meeks talked about governmental safety nets and how they tend to trap those they are supposed to help. She suggested safety nets should be more like trampolines. ‘Nets are full of holes and people fall into those holes and they never get out,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘We need to transform safety nets into trampolines so you never hit bottom but you’re boosted upward so you can fulfill whatever potential you have.’ Miller-Meeks said a government that provides a safety net with taxpayer money needs to be held accountable.” [Ad Express & Daily Iowegian, 4/18/14]

SNAP

345,406 Iowans And 11% Of Households In Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District Relied On SNAP For Food Access


11% Of Households In Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District Received SNAP. As of 2018, 11% of households in Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District received SNAP. [USDA.gov, accessed 11/29/21]

October 2020: Miller-Meeks Said Another COVID-19 Economic Relief Bill Should Facilitate SNAP Benefits To Help Those With Food Insecurity

October 2020: Miller-Meeks Said Another COVID-19 Economic Relief Bill Should Facilitate SNAP Benefits, Additional PPP Funds, And Address Unemployment. “As the debate largely centered on the pandemic, the two agreed that Congress should take swift action to reach bipartisan solutions. Negotiations on more government aid have stalled in Congress as President Donald Trump waffles on pressing the legislative branch to pass a relief package. Trump had tweeted Tuesday that he ‘instructed my representatives to stop negotiating until after the election,’ though hours later, he urged Congress to pass a new relief bill. […] Miller-Meeks agreed that the hiatus in negotiations over another relief package was ‘disappointing,’ especially seeing firsthand the struggling individuals and small businesses in her town. Another bill should provide additional Paycheck Protection Program funds, address unemployment and facilitate Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program benefits - popularly known as food stamps - to help those with food insecurity, Miller-Meeks said. She touted Iowa’s ‘conservative fiscal practices’ as helping the state better brace for the pandemic than other states, taking aim at three states under Democratic control. ‘You can’t expect the taxpayers of Iowa to bail out Illinois or New York or California for their poor fiscal practices,’ Miller-Meeks said.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 10/8/20]
**2019-2020: Miller-Meeks Voted 3 Times In The Iowa Senate To Tighten Eligibility Requirements For SNAP**

**March 2020: Miller-Meeks Voted For SF 2366, Which Would Establish Work Requirements For Access To SNAP**

2020: Miller-Meeks Voted For SF 2366, Which Tightened Eligibility Requirements For Public Programs. Miller-Meeks voted for SF 2366, “A bill for an act relating to eligibility, work, and employment and training requirements for public assistance programs, including eligibility for child care assistance and community engagement activity requirements under the Iowa health and wellness plan, and including effective date and implementation provisions.” The bill passed 31-18. [Iowa State Legislature, SF 2366, 3/3/20]

- **SF 2366 Was A Bill Establishing Work Requirements For Public Assistance Programs Including SNAP.** “Senate File 2366 relates to work, employment and training requirements for public assistance programs, and childcare, and does the following: Section 1 provides that unless required by federal law, the Department of Human Services (DHS) shall not seek, apply for, accept, or renew any waiver of work requirements for Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) benefits. Section 2 requires the DHS to assign individuals receiving SNAP benefits, subject to requirements established under federal law so they may participate in the Employment and Training (E&T) Program. […] Section 4 prohibits a person from being eligible for Medicaid unless the individual meets one of the work-related requirements specified in the Bill. The Bill specifies those individuals exempt from the work-related requirements.” [Iowa State Legislature, SF 2366 Fiscal Note, 3/2/20]

**February 2020: Miller-Meeks Voted For SF 2272, A Bill Requiring Enhanced Eligibility Verification Measures For SNAP**

2020: Miller-Meeks Voted For SF 2272, Which Introduced Eligibility Verification Measures For Public Programs. Miller-Meeks voted for SF 2272, “bill for an act relating to public assistance program oversight, and including effective date provisions.” The bill passed by vote 32-17. [Iowa State Legislature, SF 2272, 2/26/20]

- **SF 2272 Required Enhanced Eligibility Verification For SNAP.** “Senate File 2272 requires the Department of Human Services (DHS) to implement an eligibility verification system for public assistance programs to verify the eligibility of an individual who is an applicant for any such program. Division I requires the DHS to request a federal waiver from the United States Department of Agriculture Food and Nutrition Service by July 1, 2020, in order to comply with the provision of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018 regarding real-time prevention of duplicate participation upon a potential beneficiary’s application for Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) benefits. Upon federal approval, the DHS is required to contract with a third party vendor to conduct National Accuracy Clearinghouse matches and corresponding actions in accordance with the federal law and regulations.” [Iowa State Legislature, SF 2272 Fiscal Note, 2/25/20]

**April 2019: Miller-Meeks Voted For SF 334, A Bill Requiring Enhanced Eligibility Verification Measures For SNAP**

2019: Miller-Meeks Voted For SF 334, A Bill Imposing New Eligibility Requirements For Public Programs. Miller-Meeks voted for SF 334, “A bill for an act relating to public assistance program oversight.” The bill passed 30-18. [Iowa State Legislature, SF 334, 4/1/19]

- **SF 334 Required Enhanced Eligibility Verification For Medicaid, SNAP, And Other State Benefits.** “Senate File 334 requires the Department of Human Services (DHS) to implement an eligibility verification system for public assistance programs to verify the eligibility of an individual who is an applicant for any such program. For the purposes of the Bill, ‘public assistance programs’ include but are not limited to the Medicaid Program, the Family Investment Program (FIP), and the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP).”
Implementation Of SF 334 Would Have Cost Iowans More Than $24 Million Annually. “Senate File 334 is estimated to increase annual operating costs by $15.9 million in FY 2020 and $24.4 million in FY 2021. The cost in subsequent fiscal years is estimated to be $24.6 million and will increase by 2.0% annually. This includes $15.8 million in FY 2020 and $24.1 million in FY 2021 for the DHS and $169,000 in FY 2020 and $231,000 in FY 2021 for the DIA. The increase for FY 2020 includes $3.1 million in one-time costs, with an additional $290,000 in onetime costs in FY 2021.” [Iowa State Legislature, SF 334 Fiscal Note, 2/28/19]

2014: Miller-Meeks Had Refused To Say Whether Nutrition Assistance Should Be Separated From The Farm Bill

Miller-Meeks Refused To Say Whether Nutrition Assistance Should Be Separated From The Farm Bill. “When Miller-Meeks debated David Loebsack in 2014, ‘Miller-Meeks mentioned the Affordable Care Act immediately in the debate as being unaffordable, she refused to say whether she’d repeal the bill. Loebsack successfully called her on that, saying she’s been for repealing it in the past and he’s not sure where she is now. She also declined to say whether nutrition assistance should be separated from the farm bill, choosing instead to talk about curing poverty.” [Des Moines Register, 8/29/18]

2014: Miller-Meeks Falsely Claimed That The Top Item Purchased With Food Stamps Was Mountain Dew

Miller-Meeks Made A False Claim That The Top Item Purchased With Food Stamps Was Mountain Dew. “Miller-Meeks was criticized by Democrats in January 2014 after a newspaper story said she had told a group the previous fall that the top food item purchased in Iowa with food stamps is Mountain Dew. The state doesn’t keep such statistics, and she later told a reporter her remarks were taken out of context.” [Des Moines Register, 4/16/16]

Miller-Meeks Later Apologized For The Misstatement And Acknowledged The State Does Not Specifically Track Food Stamp Purchase Information

Miller-Meeks Apologized For The Misstatement And Acknowledged The State Does Not Specifically Track Food Stamp Purchase Information. “Miller-Meeks was under criticism for comments about Iowans on public assistance. She inaccurately stated in October that Mountain Dew was the top item purchased in Iowa with food stamps. Subsequently, she apologized for the misstatement and acknowledged the state does not specifically track food stamp purchase information.” [Hawk Eye, 2/25/14]

2010: Miller-Meeks Criticized A Funding Bill For Taking Money Away From Food Stamps, About Which She Said “Every $1 Million Spent In The Program Generates Or Saves 10 Iowa Jobs”

2010: Miller-Meeks Criticized A Funding Bill For Taking Money Away From Food Stamps, About Which She Said “Every $1 Million Spent In The Program Generates Or Saves 10 Iowa Jobs.” “The U.S. House of Representatives has been in August recess, but it’s scheduled to be back in session today to vote on a $26 billion spending bill that the Senate approved last week. The money has two purposes - to help states pay for education expenses, and to help pay for Medicaid, the state-federal government health insurance program for the poor. […] Mariannette Miller-Meeks, R-Ottumwa ‘This bill is a double shot to Iowa. It takes $12 billion from food stamps to put money into an education system that needs to be reformed. Experts like the Iowa Policy Project say the food stamp program is the greatest government-funded stimulus for Iowa because every $1 million spent in the program generates or saves 10 Iowa jobs. Is David Loebsack honestly going to vote to take food from Americans who are at their most vulnerable and cost Iowans more jobs just to pay for the Democrats’ election-year grandstanding?’” [Des Moines Register, 8/10/10]
November 2021: Miller-Meeks Co-Sponsored A Bill To Keep Biofuel Mandate Levels High

December 2021: Miller-Meeks Criticized The Biden Administration For Reducing Biofuel Mandate Levels And Said She Supported The Defend The Blend Act In Order To Keep Levels Consistent. “#Biofuels producers deserve better after waiting for all year for certainty. It is unprecedented for this Admin to retroactively reduce finalized levels. I support @RepAshleyHinson ‘s Defend the Blend Act so the Admin does not go back on their word again. LINK: U.S. EPA proposes biofuel mandate cuts, a boost to pandemic-hit refiners” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 12/7/21]

November 2021: Miller-Meeks Said She Signed On As An Original Co-Sponsor To The Defend The Blend Act. “Proud to support #biofuels producers by signing on as an original cosponsor of @RepAshleyHinson, @RodneyDavis, @RepRonKind, and @RepAngieCraig ’s bipartisan Defend the Blend Act.” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 11/30/21]

2021: Miller-Meeks Repeatedly Called On Biden To Raise Renewable Fuel Standard Volumes, Which She Called “Good For American Consumers, Farmers, And The Environment”

November 2021: Miller-Meeks Said A Strong Renewable Fuel Standard Was “Good For American Consumers, Farmers, And The Environment” And Called On The Biden Administration To “Raise, Not Lower RFS Volumes.” “A strong RFS is good for American consumers, farmers, and the environment. As gas prices continue to soar, the Administration should raise, not lower RFS volumes.” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 11/16/21]

September 2021: Miller-Meeks Joined A Letter Urging Biden To Uphold The Renewable Fuel Standard In Order To Maintain Demand For Ethanol. “Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, R-Iowa, issued the following news release on Sept. 22, 2021: Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks joined a letter to President Joe Biden urging him to keep his promises on upholding the Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS) by not decimating the demand for billions of gallons of ethanol. ‘Then-candidate Biden made numerous promises to biofuels producers that he would support their livelihoods and uphold the RFS. I am disappointed to see his Administration has begun to make decisions that would be counter to his previous commitments,’ said Miller-Meeks. ‘Biofuels are incredibly important to Iowa's economy, putting money in the pockets of our producers and creating countless jobs across our state. My colleagues and I in the bipartisan Biofuels Caucus will continue to fight to ensure that our energy sector continues to use biofuels to end our dependence on foreign energy, diversify our energy usage, become more environmentally friendly, and create good-paying jobs.’ In their letter, the members highlighted that while running for President, President Biden stated that President Trump's RFS waivers were ‘harmful’ and called for ‘setting strong (Renewable Volumes Obligation) levels for 2021.’ Now, it is again being reported that President Biden's Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is ‘considering big cuts to biofuel blending mandates for 2020, 2021, and 2022.’ This past June, it was reported the Biden Administration was ‘considering ways to provide relief to U.S. oil refiners from biofuel blending mandates.’” [Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks via Targeted News Service, 9/22/21]

- The Letter Urged Biden To Uphold The Renewable Fuel Standard, Which Sustained Demand For Billions Of Gallons Of Ethanol. “U.S. Representative Rodney Davis (R-IL) and a group of House Republicans, including co-chairs of the House Biofuels Caucus, are urging President Biden to keep his promise on upholding the Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS) by not decimating the demand for billions of gallons of ethanol. […]Also signing the letter are Reps. Darin LaHood (R-IL), Tom Emmer (R-MN), Ann Wagner (R-MO), Tracey Mann (R-KS), Mariannette Miller-Meeks, M.D. (R-IA), Jim Hagedorn (R-MN), Vicky Hartzler (R-MO), James Comer (R-KY), Ron Estes (R-KS), Jake LaTurner (R-KS), James R. Baird (R-IN), Adam Kinzinger (R-IL), Sam Graves (R-MO), Donald J. Bacon (R-NE), Blaine Luetkemeyer (R-MO), and Mike Bost (R-IL).” [River Bender, 9/22/21]

June 2021: Miller-Meeks Joined A Letter Urging Biden Uphold The 2020 Navigable Waters Protection Rule
And Support Biofuels. “Today, June 15th, 2021, Reps. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02), Ashley Hinson (IA-01), and Randy Feenstra (IA-04) sent a letter to both U.S. Secretary of Agriculture Tom Vilsack and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Administrator Michael S. Regan urging the EPA not to repeal the 2020 Navigable Waters Protection Rule (NWPR) and expressing concern over reports that the Administration is considering ethanol blend mandate reprieves to oil refiners, which would devastate Iowa's biofuel industry. The lawmakers wrote: ‘The link between energy policy and agricultural policy is not only strong, but it is co-dependent. We ask that you please make a commitment to ensure these conversations about clean water and biofuels are not one-sided. Conversations and decisions need not only to come from both USDA and EPA together, but also from real farmers in rural America who understand the art and science of farming deeper than any of us are able to from behind our desks. To empower our farmers, the Administration needs to listen to their concerns, suggestions, and expertise to make an informed decision.’” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 6/15/21]

May 2021: Miller-Meeks Joined A Letter To Biden Calling Biofuels “A Low Carbon, Cost-Effective Choice To Consumers” And Suggesting Consideration For Biofuels As A “Permanent Clean Energy Solution.” “Today, May 25th, 2021, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02) joined Sens. Joni Ernst (R-IA) and Chuck Grassley (R-IA), and Reps. Randy Feenstra (IA-04) and Ashley Hinson (IA-01) in sending a letter to President Joe Biden urging him to uphold his promise to support biofuels. As the letter states, Biden previously pledged to ‘promote and advance renewable energy, ethanol, and other biofuels to help rural America.’ However, the Administration’s proposed infrastructure bill would spend $174 billion to subsidize electric vehicles while hardly mentioning the biofuel industry. The members point out that Biden has thus far fallen short on his promise. ‘It is our hope that your Administration will come to the table to support the proven solution that biofuels provide to reduce carbon emissions in the transportation sector as quickly as possible,’ the members wrote. ‘The Administration should support flex-fuel vehicles and cost-effective infrastructure improvements that will pave the way to higher biofuel blends.’ The members also urged Biden to recognize the ability for biofuels to be a permanent clean energy solution as developments in farming practices and in carbon capture technology are moving biofuels closer to becoming net carbon negative. ‘Biofuels provide an immediate solution to help decarbonize our transportation sector while supporting rural America and providing a low carbon, cost-effective choice to consumers,’ the members continued. ‘Biofuels should not be treated as a transition fuel but prioritized as a fuel of the future.’” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 5/25/21]

March 2021: Miller-Meeks Called For Diversifying Energy Sources And Powering Iowa’s Economy With “Biofuels, Ethanol, Wind, Solar, And Biogas.” “The recent cold weather proved that Iowa has made smart investments in its energy plans. But we can’t stop here, there is more work to be done to ensure we can keep the lights on for all Iowans. States need a mix of cost-competitive energy sources, including wind and solar so we can capitalize on low fuel costs and provide more local distribution. The grid of the future, however, demands more. We also will need to focus on technology like energy storage for all generation sources and responsible energy-efficiency programs. Meeting the ever-increasing energy demands will call for emerging generation technologies such as biogas, community solar, and more distributed resources. Coupled with increased investments in transmission infrastructure and more collaboration between grid operators, our energy grid will be more resilient and reliable in the face of natural disasters. By harnessing our natural resources for both energy and fuel, renewables can truly power Iowa's economy. Biofuels, ethanol, wind, solar, and biogas provide a ripple of economic impact throughout our state.” [Southeast Iowa Union, Miller-Meeks Op-Ed, 3/24/21]
country that impacted the work of our nation’s farmers. Iowa farmers were hit particularly hard by the derecho, or inland hurricane, storm, and are still working to recover their losses. Representative Feenstra’s bipartisan amendment would make systems available to producers who suffered disaster losses in 2020. This bipartisan amendment would not only help Iowans, but also producers in states harmed by wildfires, such as California and Oregon, and drought, like we saw in New Mexico and Texas. […] His amendment was bipartisan, commonsense, and would not increase the cost of this bill in any way.” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 2/26/21] (VIDEO) 00:01:30

- **Miller-Meeks Tweeted Her Support For Rep. Feenstra’s Disaster Relief Funding Amendment.**
  “@RepFeenstra’s bipartisan amendment at @HouseAgGOP was one of TWO Republican-led amendments that were not blocked, and now there are plans to remove it at the last minute. Last summer’s derecho devasted Iowa farmers, and we must continue to support them. #iowaag” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 2/24/21]

- **Rep. Feenstra’s Amendment Was Removed By Speaker Nancy Pelosi Before The Relief Bill Passed The House 219-212.** Early Saturday morning, the U.S. House passed a $1.9 trillion pandemic relief bill 219-212 allowing it to progress to the Senate. […] While in the House, Feenstra proposed an amendment to the bill that would include $4 billion for derecho victims, which was removed by Speaker Dancy [sic] Pelosi. On Friday evening, Feenstra took to Twitter to voice his frustration. ‘I’m extremely disappointed that House Democrats have voted to turn their backs on (Iowa) farmers by voting to ax derecho relief,’ Feenstra wrote.” [KCCI 8 Des Moines, 2/27/21]

- **Rep. Feenstra’s Amendment Had Been Adopted By The House Agriculture Committee 24-23 And Would “Provide Relief For Producers Who Were Impacted By Natural Disasters In 2020.”** “On Wednesday, the House Agriculture Committee held their markup on the $1.9 trillion stimulus bill. Rep. Feenstra (IA-04) proposed several amendments, including one to provide relief for producers who were impacted by natural disasters in 2020. It would include damage from storms with high winds, like the derecho that impacted approximately 43 percent of cropland in Iowa last August. The House Agriculture Committee voted 24 to 23 to adopt Feenstra’s amendment, paving the way for Iowa ag producers to receive additional relief. Many producers were already grappling with market disruptions due to the COVID-19 pandemic when the derecho struck, so securing this disaster relief is a big win for Iowa farmers.” [Office Of Rep. Randy Feenstra, Press Release, 2/12/21]

### 2021: Miller-Meeks Called WHIP+, A Relief Program Targeting Producers Facing Losses From 2018 And 2019 Natural Disasters, “A Vital Resource For Farmers And Producers In Iowa”

Miller-Meeks Called WHIP+ “A Vital Resource For Farmers And Producers In Iowa.” “WHIP+ is a vital resource for farmers and producers in Iowa, and I was proud to cosponsor @RepThompson’s bipartisan bill to help farmers hit by disasters like the 2020 derecho. #IA02 #IowaAg” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 8/14/21]

- **WHIP+ (The Wildfire And Hurricane Indemnity Program Plus) Provided Payments To Producers Who Suffered Losses Due To Natural Disasters Occurring In 2018 And 2019.** “The Wildfire and Hurricane Indemnity Program Plus (WHIP+) provided payments to producers to offset losses from hurricanes, wildfires, and other qualifying natural disasters that occurred in 2018 and 2019. WHIP+ covered losses of crops, trees, bushes, and vines that occurred as a result of those disaster events, milk losses due to adverse weather conditions, and losses to on-farm stored commodities.” [U.S. Department of Agriculture, accessed 12/7/21]

### 2021: Miller-Meeks Congratulated Iowa Farmers On A Successful Planting Season Following The 2020 Derecho

May 2021: Miller-Meeks Congratulated Iowa Farmers On Corn And Soybean Planting After A Derecho Hit The Year Before “Great news for Iowa farmers! #IA02 #IowaAg With COVID-19 and the derecho last year, Iowa farmers were hit hard, and now they are ready to bounce back with 94% of corn and 83% of soybean planting complete!” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 5/22/21]
**Meat And Poultry**

**Miller-Meeks Defended The Meatpacking Industry’s Handling Of COVID-19, Which Caused Severe Outbreaks At Meatpacking Plants**

Miller-Meeks Defended Meatpacking Companies’ Response To The COVID-19 Pandemic And Said “Even Experts Like Dr. Fauci Didn't Know What Was Going On In Those Early Months.” “The numbers of meatpacking workers infected and killed by the coronavirus are much higher than previously known, a congressional review has found. More than 59,000 workers of the country’s five largest meatpackers were infected, and about 270 died, according to a report by the House Select Subcommittee on the Coronavirus Crisis that was made public Wednesday. [...] U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, R-Iowa, is a subcommittee member who defended the companies’ response to the pandemic. She said she personally verified that a plant in her hometown of Ottumwa had implemented a variety of safety precautions in April and May 2020. ‘Let’s not forget that even experts like Dr. Fauci didn’t know what was going on in those early months, and guidance was changing daily,’ she said Wednesday, in reference to Dr. Anthony Fauci, the nation’s leading infectious disease expert.” [Iowa Capital Dispatch, 10/27/21]

Miller-Meeks Said The Majority Of COVID Cases At The JBS Plant In Ottumwa Came From “In The Home Or Other Living Conditions Or In Transportation With Carpooling” And Not From Inside The Plant. “Iowa Congresswoman Mariannette Miller-Meeks is defending how the meatpacking plant in her hometown of Ottumwa responded in the first weeks of the pandemic. ‘Let’s not forget that even experts like Dr. Fauci didn’t know what was going on in those early months and guidance was changing daily,’ Miller-Meeks said today during a U.S. House subcommittee hearing. A new congressional report has found at least 269 employees at the five largest U.S. meatpacking companies died of Covid during the first year of the pandemic — three times higher than previously reported — and 59,000 U.S. packing plant employees tested positive for the virus. Miller-Meeks, a Republican, is a member of the U.S. House Select Subcommittee on the Coronavirus Crisis and she is pushing back on the idea the majority of JBS workers in Ottumwa who contracted Covid got the virus inside the plant. ‘People don’t spend 24 hours a day at their workplace,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘They are at home or in their community and our contract tracing showed that most of our spread came from in the home or other living conditions or in transportation with carpooling.’” [Radio Iowa, 10/27/21]

**June 2021: Miller-Meeks Introduced A Bill To Tackle Anticompetitive Practices In The Meat And Poultry Industries, Calling The Practices A Threat To The Food Supply And National Security**

June 2021: Miller-Meeks Introduced A Bill To Tackle Anticompetitive Practices In The Meat And Poultry Industries. “Today, June 23rd, 2021, Reps. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02) and Abigail Spanberger (VA-07) introduced the Meat Packing Special Investigator Act. This bipartisan and bicameral bill would tackle anticompetitive practices in the meat and poultry industries that threaten the American food supply and U.S. national security. This legislation is the House companion to S. 2036, which was introduced earlier this month by Sens. Chuck Grassley (R-IA), Jon Tester (D-MT), and Mike Rounds (R-SD). ‘Anticompetitive practices in the meatpacking industry are a threat to both our food supply and national security. Iowa producers are losing money even though consumers are paying higher prices at the store,’ said Miller-Meeks. ‘The Packers and Stockyards Act must be strictly enforced to address the rampant anticompetitive practices in our meat and poultry industries, and our Meat Packing Special Investigator Act will do just that. I am proud to introduce this bipartisan and bicameral legislation with Congresswoman Spanberger to support Iowa’s farmers, ranchers, and producers.’” [Office of Rep. Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 6/23/21]

- Miller-Meeks “Anticompetitive Practices In The Meatpacking Industry Are A Threat To Both Our Food Supply And National Security.” “‘Anticompetitive practices in the meatpacking industry are a threat to both our food supply and national security. Iowa producers are losing money even though consumers are paying higher prices at the store,’ said Miller-Meeks. ‘The Packers and Stockyards Act must be strictly enforced to
address the rampant anticompetitive practices in our meat and poultry industries, and our Meat Packing Special Investigator Act will do just that. I am proud to introduce this bipartisan and bicameral legislation with Congresswoman Spanberger to support Iowa’s farmers, ranchers, and producers.”” [Office of Rep. Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 6/23/21]

2019: Miller-Meeks Voted To Criminalize Trespassing On Animal Food Production Facilities

2020: Miller-Meeks Voted For Increasing Penalties For Trespassing On Food Operations. Miller-Meeks voted for SF 2413, “A bill for an act relating to agriculture and food, including the powers and duties of the department of agriculture and land stewardship, providing penalties, making penalties applicable, and including effective date provisions.” The bill passed by vote 34-11. [Iowa State Legislature, SF 2413, 6/5/20]

- SF 2413 Criminalized Trespassing On The Property Of Food Operations Including Those Producing Meat, Poultry, Or Dairy. The Act amends Iowa Code chapter 716 governing trespass to property by creating the offense of food operation trespass (Iowa Code section 716.7A). A person commits the offense by entering or remaining on the property of a food operation without the consent of a person who has real or apparent authority over the property. […] A food animal includes an animal belonging to the bovine, caprine, ovine, or porcine species; farm deer; turkeys, chickens, or other poultry; fish or other aquatic animals; or honey bees. A food operation is a location where a food animal is produced or kept, a location where a meat or poultry product, milk or milk product, eggs or an egg product, aquatic product, or honey is prepared (e.g., processed and packaged) for human consumption, or a food establishment or a farmers market that sells or offers for sale a meat or poultry product, milk or milk product, eggs or egg product, aquatic product, or honey. The Act was amended in 2020 Iowa Acts, HF 2641 (see Taxation), by expressly providing that a food establishment or farmers market is not a food operation.” [Iowa Legislative Services Agency, 7/20]
## Significant Findings

- Miller-Meeks echoed “Big Lie” rhetoric in questioning her own election results, claiming she had been “cheated down” to a six-vote margin, but on other occasions saying that she did not think there had been any fraud.

- Miller-Meeks questioned the official results of the election as confirmed by recounts and precinct audits, claiming in June 2021 that she won by a larger margin and that “six is what they cheated me down to.”

- In December 2020, Miller-Meeks gave conflicting statements saying both that every legal ballot in her race was counted and that there were votes in her favor that were not counted.

- Citing a “haphazard” state recount, Hart filed an electoral challenge in the U.S. House in December 2020, forcing Miller-Meeks to be seated provisionally the following month; Hart did not withdraw her election challenge and concede to Miller-Meeks until March 2021.

- Hart’s campaign identified 22 ballots they believed were legally cast but wrongly uncounted.

- Miller-Meeks accused Democrats challenging her victory of engaging in a “disinformation campaign” and threatening the public’s faith in elections.

- Miller-Meeks said “there was fraud” and “there were irregularities” in the 2020 Presidential Election and called for an investigation, despite court decisions that found no such evidence.

- Miller-Meeks accepted more than $50,000 in campaign contributions from members who objected to the 2020 Electoral College vote count.

- October 2021: Miller-Meeks appeared at public events with Trump where he falsely claimed he was the rightful President.

- Miller-Meeks said Iowans could trust election results “because of the election law changes we have made in Iowa in the past three years.”

- Miller-Meeks said she supported Iowa’s tighter absentee ballot deadlines and voter ID laws, the latter of which she called “highly supported by the public.”

- January 2021: Miller-Meeks said she supported Republican proposals for a “federal baseline” for vote-by-mail and the possibility of nationally adopting voter ID laws.

- 2021: In response to the January 6th insurrection, Miller-Meeks said “I think there is plenty of blame to go around to all of us,” criticized Democrats, and defended Trump’s comments.

- January 2021: Miller-Meeks voted against objecting to the counting of 2020 electoral votes from key states.
 Miller-Meeks had previously said “I have suspicions about the integrity of the votes cast in several states” in her statement released on the scheduled vote to certify.

2021: Miller-Meeks voted for establishing a bipartisan commission to investigate the January 6th attack on the US Capitol.

2021: Miller-Meeks voted against establishing a select committee to investigate January 6th attack following the failure to establish a bipartisan commission.

Miller-Meeks said that a January 6th Select Committee would be “another partisan, political hack job” and compared it to the house investigation of Russian election interference.

January 2022: Miller-Meeks said she did “understand the anger” about January 6th insurrectionists awaiting court dates and that Republican control of the House would result in “a more fair investigation.”

January 2021: Miller-Meeks voted against impeaching Trump for incitement of an insurrection and said impeachment “would create a bigger wedge and divide in our country.”

Miller-Meeks said impeachment Trump in January 2021 would “only further divide the nation” and “there are other ways to hold the president accountable.”

Miller-Meeks voted against the resolution calling on vice president pence to invoke the 25th amendment and remove Trump from office.

2019: Miller-Meeks spoke at a rally with “racist provocateur and holocaust denier” Nick Fuentes and did not object when Fuentes called for a “monoculture.”

Miller-Meeks denounced Fuentes the next day, saying she had not been aware who he was or what he represented, but some felt she had “condemned Fuentes, but not his ideas.”

Fuentes was later involved in the January 6th insurrection and was subpoenaed by the January 6th Select Committee in January 2022 to testify on his role.

January 2021: Miller-Meeks compared violence at the January 6th insurrection to 2020 racial justice protests, the latter of which she falsely claimed Biden had not condemned.

Immediately following the January 6th insurrection, Miller-Meeks had said it was “incumbent” on Trump and Pence to “decry and denounce any violent activities” on the Capitol grounds.

2019: Miller-Meeks said she supported an individual’s 2nd Amendment rights “so that they can support themselves against a government that becomes tyrannical.”
November 2020: Miller-Meeks Claimed Victory Over Rita Hart While Votes Were Still Being Counted And The Race Was In A Statistical Dead Heat

November 2020: After Pulling Ahead Late On Election Day, Miller-Meeks Declared Victory With A Margin Of 282 Votes, Despite A Possible Recount. “Republican state Sen. Mariannette Miller-Meeks of Ottumwa has declared victory with some votes yet to be counted and a recount possible in a tight race for the Iowa 2nd District congressional seat being vacated by retiring seven-term Democrat Dave Loebsack. With all precincts reporting, Miller-Meeks held a razor-thin 282 vote lead over Democrat Rita Hart out of the nearly 394,000 votes cast in the race. Early voting and a large margin in heavily Democratic Johnson County with nearly 70 percent of the vote gave Hart, a former Democratic state senator from Wheatland, an early lead in the 24-county district that includes Scott, Muscatine, Clinton and Louisa counties. But Miller-Meeks pulled ahead late Tuesday night, leading with 49.95% of the votes cast to Hart's 49.87%, according to unofficial results. The Associated Press had yet to call the race. Hart had led Miller-Meeks with 109,763 votes to Miller-Meeks' 91,068 votes, with 13 of the district's 24 counties counted as of 10:43 p.m.” [Quad-City Times, 11/4/20]

November 2020: Following Election Day, The Contest For Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District Was In Statistical Dead Heat And Remained Undeclared As Absentee Ballots Were Being Received. “The victor in a very tight race in Iowa’s Second Congressional District still hasn’t been called. As of 5:00 a.m. Wednesday, with all 24 counties reporting, it’s a statistical dead heat between Republican Mariannette Miller-Meeks and Democrat Rita Hart. It was an even split, percentage-wise between the two, with each taking 50% of the vote but Miller-Meeks currently has the advantage in the vote count with 282 more than Hart. The unofficial vote total from the Iowa Secretary of State’s website does not take into account all mail-in votes and those can still be counted up until next week. As long as the votes were postmarked by midnight on Nov. 2nd and are received by noon on Nov. 9th, they can still be counted.” [WHO Des Moines, 11/4/20]

November 2020: Miller-Meeks Claimed Victory For The Second Time Since Election Day, Despite Even Republican Governor Kim Reynolds Saying She Was “Still Waiting” On Results. “While Republicans like Gov. Kim Reynolds say the country is ‘still waiting’ on the results of last week's presidential election, the Republican candidate in the country's tightest U.S. Congressional race isn't waiting on Iowa officials to declare her own victory. With all 24 counties’ election results certified, the two candidates in Iowa's 2nd Congressional District are currently separately by 47 votes. With her bid just past the post, Republican Mariannette Miller-Meeks claimed victory for the second time since Election Day Tuesday night. ‘I express my heartfelt gratitude to the voters of Iowa's 2nd Congressional District and acknowledge my opponent (Democrat) Rita Hart's grace and positive demeanor during this challenging campaign,’ Miller-Meeks said in a statement. ‘The election is over and it is time to move forward together and focus on the priorities that will best serve Iowans.’” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 11/11/20]

November 2020: Countywide Recounts And Precinct Audits Were Conducted At The Request Of Hart Following Miller-Meeks’ Apparent One-Ten-Thousandth Of A Point Lead

November 2020: Countywide Recounts And Precinct Audits Were Conducted At The Request Of Hart Following Miller-Meeks’ Apparent One-Ten-Thousandth Of A Point Lead. “Each county will assemble a three-person recount board, with each campaign appointing one individual and then mutually agreeing on the third. Boards will then recount ballots, going precinct by precinct to tabulate each vote again. It's up to the recount board to decide whether to do a machine or hand recount. Only the U.S. House second district race will be recounted. There were 394,383 votes cast in the election. Miller-Meeks has a one_ten-thousandth of a point lead. Given the tight margin, Iowa Secretary of State Paul Pate told the Quad-City Times on Tuesday there is the potential the result could change enough to impact the race. […] Errors discovered in Jasper County and Lucas County in the days after election night led changed votes, and leaders. Auditors in both counties said human data-entry errors were to blame. Countywide recounts and precinct audits were ordered in both counties. Jasper and Lucas will have to recount votes again to comply with the Hart campaign request.” [Ottumwa Courier, 11/18/20]
November 2020: Kevin McCarthy Claimed On Fox News That 300 Iowans Had Re-Voted, A Claim That PolitiFact Found “Pants On Fire” False

PolitiFact: Kevin McCarthy’s Claim That 300 Iowans Re-Voted, Costing Miller-Meeks Her Lead, Was “Pants On Fire” False. “Kevin McCarthy: In Iowa, ‘they have allowed a little over 300 people to re-vote.’ PolitiFact’s ruling: Pants on Fire Here’s why: House Minority Leader Kevin McCarthy, R-California, was talking on conservative commentator Laura Ingraham’s Fox News Channel show, The Ingraham Angle, on Nov. 5 about Republican claims of possible voter fraud when he referred to Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District race. Democratic Party candidate Rita Hart and Republican Party candidate Mariannette Miller-Meeks were in a tight battle for the seat. ‘I don’t have all the facts but I (sic) was just reported that they have allowed a little over 300 people to re-vote and now we’re behind,’ McCarthy said. […] McCarthy said that 300 voters in Iowa were allowed to re-vote to change an election outcome. That is wrong. Pate and Parrott laid out in their news conference how the state first reported votes in Miller-Meeks’ favor swung to being in Hart’s favor. No one was allowed to re-vote, Pate’s office said. And even though McCarthy couched his televised statement by saying he didn’t know all the facts, he said it anyway, and Ingraham picked up on it as though it were fact. We rate the claim of 300 Iowans allowed to re-vote as Pants on Fire.” [PolitiFact Texas, Austin American-Statesman, 11/20/20]

November 2020: A State Election Board Certified Miller-Meeks’ Victory By Six Votes

Miller-Meeks’ Victory By Six Votes Was Certified By A State Board In Late November 2020. “A state board certified Iowa Republican Mariannette Miller-Meeks as the representative-elect for Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District Monday in a race that came down to just six votes — the closest federal election in the country this year. Though Democrat Rita Hart is likely to challenge the results in court, the action marks the end of weeks of recounts that showed a steadily narrowing race. Shortly after Monday’s board vote, Miller-Meeks thanked her supporters. ‘I will never quit fighting for you and your opportunity at the American Dream!’ she tweeted. ‘Let’s get to work!’ The state Board of Canvass met Monday afternoon in a brief teleconference to certify the results: 196,964 votes cast for Miller-Meeks to the 196,958 votes cast for Hart.” [Des Moines Register, 11/30/20]

December 2020: Miller-Meeks Told A Local Paper That Every Legal Ballot In her Race Had Been Counted, But Told An Iowa PBS Affiliate That There Were Votes For Her That Had Not Been Counted

Iowa City Press-Citizen: Miller-Meeks Said Every Legal Ballot In Her Race Had Been Counted, But Also Said “There Were Votes That Were Cast That Were For Me Also That Were Not Counted And That I Did Not Receive.” “Miller-Meeks repeatedly told the Press-Citizen in an interview last week that ‘every legal ballot (in the 2nd District race) was counted’ and that Hart was attempting to use a ‘partisan political process’ to change the election's result. But Miller-Meeks also acknowledged in an interview on PBS' Iowa Press over the weekend that ‘there were votes that were cast that were for me also that were not counted and that I did not receive.’” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 12/16/20]


December 2020: Rita Hart Filed An Electoral Challenge In The US House Under The Federal Contested Election Act Following What She Called A “Haphazard” Iowa Recount. “Miller-Meeks defeated Hart by just six votes after a bipartisan state canvassing board certified the election results following a district-wide recount in all 24 counties. Hart contends 22 ballots were unlawfully excluded from the certified election results. Hart and her attorneys, too, argue thousands of ballots with recorded under and over votes were not examined for voter intent, due to a ‘haphazard’ recount that was marred by errors, discrepancies and inconsistencies in how ballots were reviewed from county to county. Hart formally filed her challenge with the U.S. House on Dec. 22 under the Federal Contested Election Act. ‘As this provisional seating makes clear, we will not know who won this race until all votes have been counted,’ Hart said in a statement Sunday. ‘It is most important that we get this right and that the candidate who has received the most votes is seated.’” [Quad-City Times, 1/3/21]

...
• **January 2021:** Miller-Meeks Said “I Will Not Let Partisan Gamesmanship Stand In My Way To Deliver Results For The People Of Iowa. Now Is The Time To Put The 2020 Election Behind Us.” Allowing Miller-Meeks to take office does not preclude the House from potentially overturning the state's certified election results and later seating Hart pending the outcome of a House review of her election challenge. ‘To those whose support I have yet to earn, I will listen to you, I will fight for you, and I will work to be your representative too,’ Miller-Meeks said in a statement Sunday. ‘I will not let partisan gamesmanship stand in my way to deliver results for the people of Iowa,’ she said. ‘Now is the time to put the 2020 election behind us, unite our country, and work together to tackle the pressing issues that face our country.’” [Quad-City Times, 1/3/21]

---

**March 2021:** Rita Hart Withdrew Her Election Challenge And Acknowledged Miller-Meeks’ Victory, After Facing Backlash For A Contentious Case Based On 22 Ballots That Were Allegedly Wrongfully Uncounted

March 2021: Rita Hart Withdrew Her Election Challenge And Acknowledged Miller-Meeks’ Victory. “Rita Hart, the Iowa Democrat who lost a House race by just six votes, is withdrawing her challenge to Republican Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks. In a statement posted to Twitter on Wednesday, the former state senator said she made the decision ‘after many conversations with people I trust about the future of this contest.’ ‘I wish Mariannette Miller-Meeks all the best as she serves the people of this great state as Congresswoman,’ she said. ‘This has been a difficult process for all of those involved and it's incredibly important that we work together to reform the system so this does not happen again in the future.’” [NPR, 3/31/21]

• Miller-Meeks: “I'm Deeply Appreciative That We're Ending This Now.” “I'm deeply appreciative that we're ending this now,’ Ms. Miller-Meeks said in a recorded statement on Wednesday evening. ‘It's time to move forward, to unite as one group of people supporting Iowa's Second Congressional District.”’ [New York Times, 3/31/21]

• **March 2021:** Miller-Meeks Said Hart “Did The Right Thing” In Conceding Rather Than “Drag The Whole Country Through Another Contentious Process.” “Miller-Meeks, in statement, thanked Hart for ending the challenge. ‘I know how extremely difficult it is to lose an election, but for the people to have faith and confidence in the election system and Iowa laws, it was gracious of her to concede at this time,’ said Miller-Meeks, who has been serving provisionally in the House while the contest continued. ‘I look forward to continuing to work to represent the people of Iowa's Second District.’ Miller-Meeks called the end of the contest ‘a tremendous relief’ as she arrived at a vaccination clinic at the Washington County Department of Public Health. She said Hart ‘did the right thing’ rather than ‘drag the whole country through another contentious process.’” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 3/31/21]

• **New York Times:** “Hart’s Campaign Had Identified 22 Ballots That They Believed Were Legally Cast But ‘Wrongfully’ Uncounted By State Election Officials.” “Ms. Hart’s campaign had identified 22 ballots that they believed were legally cast but ‘wrongfully’ uncounted by state election officials during a districtwide recount in the fall. Rather than taking her case to court in Iowa before the election was certified, Ms. Hart opted to wait and appeal the results to the House Administration Committee, invoking a 1960s law. With Democrats in control of the chamber, they would have run the review and had the power to order their own recount and a vote by the full House on whether to unseat Ms. Miller-Meeks in favor of their own candidate, which would have added to their eight-seat majority.” [New York Times, 3/31/21]

CNN: “Miller-Meeks’ Lawyers Warned Monday That Hart's Case Could Damage The Public's Faith In Its Elections.” “Miller-Meeks' lawyers warned Monday that Hart's case could damage the public's faith in its elections if a Democratic-controlled House Administration Committee investigated her case, and a Democratic-controlled House voted to seat a Democrat despite the verdict of the state's election board. They asked in the brief, ‘At what point would the committee be merely searching for a result rather than searching for the will of Iowans?’” [CNN, 3/29/21]
June 2021: Miller-Meeks Claimed Democrats Had Engaged In Disinformation In What She Called A “Brazen Attempt To Overturn A State-Certified Election”

Miller-Meeks Said Democrats Engaged In A “Disinformation Campaign” And “Misinformation Campaign” During The 2020 Recount In Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District. “With the Senate poised to vote this week on S. 1, their version of House Speaker Nancy Pelosi’s election takeover bill, I am reminded of how the Democrats did everything they could to cast doubt on my own hard-fought election victory and how S. 1 is their effort to take their disinformation campaign about Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District election to the national stage. For those who did not closely follow that 2020 election saga, the most important thing to know is it took my Democratic opponent and Democratic Party leaders like Speaker Pelosi nearly five months to accept that a slim majority of voters in Iowa’s 2nd District duly elected me as their legitimate representative. But by the time they admitted the obvious, the damage of their misinformation campaign was already done.” [Fox News, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks Op-Ed, 6/22/21]

June 2021: Miller-Meeks Claimed She “Got Elected By More Than Six Votes” But “Six Is What They Cheated Me Down To”

Miller-Meeks Op-Ed: Democrats “Did Everything They Could To Cast Doubt On My Own Hard-Fought Election Victory” In A “Brazen Attempt To Overturn A State-Certified Election.” “With the Senate poised to vote this week on S. 1, their version of House Speaker Nancy Pelosi’s election takeover bill, I am reminded of how the Democrats did everything they could to cast doubt on my own hard-fought election victory and how S. 1 is their effort to take their disinformation campaign about Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District election to the national stage. […] But for Pelosi and her fellow Democrats, their brazen attempt to overturn a state-certified election was always about furthering their ultimate goal—rewriting election laws to guarantee the outcome in their favor forever.” [Fox News, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks Op-Ed, 6/22/21]

June 2021: Miller-Meeks Went Back On Her Previous Statement, Saying “I Don’t Think That There Was Fraud In This Election” And Encouraging Iowans To “Be Confident In Election Integrity”

Miller-Meeks Said She Did Not Think There Was Fraud In Her 2020 Election After Previously Saying She Was “Cheated Down” To A Six-Vote Margin. “Miller-Meeks won her race for Iowa’s second district congressional seat by just six votes. In late June told a crowd in Davenport she had been ‘cheated down’ to that margin in the district-wide recount. Last night, Miller-Meeks took issue with how some county auditors handled tabulation errors, but she said Iowans can trust the final certified result. ‘I don’t think that there was fraud in this election,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘I think that Iowans can be confident of election integrity and they can be confident of the process.’” [Radio Iowa, 7/9/21]

2020 Presidential Election Disinformation

Miller-Meeks Said “There Was Fraud” And “There Were Irregularities” In The 2020 Presidential Election And Called For An Investigation, Despite Court Decisions That Found No Evidence

Miller-Meeks: “There Were Irregularities” In The 2020 Presidential Election And “There Were States That Violated Their Own Legislative Codes. And That’s Something That I Think Can Be Looked At And Should Be Looked At.” PRICE: “But did fraud cost him the election or not?” MILLER-MEEKS: “I’d say that there were
irregularities and that there were states that violated their own legislative codes. And that's something that I think can be looked at and should be looked at. And I think states should be very proactive in looking at how they can improve their election system.” [YouTube, WHO13, 11/7/21] (VIDEO) 00:06:08

January 2021: When Asked Whether She Regretted Not Doing More To Push Back On Trump’s Claims About Election Fraud, Miller-Meeks Said “Every Individual, Whether A Candidate For Office Or Not, Is Personally Responsible For Their Own Comments And Conduct.” “Iowa's Republican congressional and statewide leaders have addressed the topic of election fraud in recent weeks, but to varying degrees of clarity and vagueness. As Trump departs and President-elect Joe Biden is sworn in, The Gazette-Lee Des Moines Bureau asked Iowa Republican for specific responses to the same three questions: whether they acknowledge Biden as the next president; whether they believe the election was free and fair; and whether they regret not doing more to push back at Trump's baseless claims about election fraud. The bureau posed the questions to Iowa's top Republican officials: U.S. Sens. Chuck Grassley and Joni Ernst; U.S. Reps. Ashley Hinson, Mariannette Miller-Meeks and Randy Feenstra; Gov. Kim Reynolds; and state party Chairman Jeff Kaufmann. […] Said Miller-Meeks, 'Every individual, whether a candidate for office or not, is personally responsible for their own comments and conduct. I supported President Trump based on his policies and results for the American people and our country such as cutting taxes and decreasing business regulations. Prior to COVID, those policies created an unparalleled economic boom with expansive job growth and wage increases.'” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 1/18/21]

Quad-City Times: Miller-Meeks “Insisted ‘There Was Fraud’ In The 2020 Presidential Election, Despite A Series Of Reviews And Court Cases That Found No Evidence Of Widespread Issues.” “Miller-Meeks in an interview with the Quad-City Times last week, while recognizing Democrat Joe Biden as president-elect and voting to reject a challenge to Biden's Electoral College victory, insisted ‘there was fraud’ in the 2020 presidential election, despite a series of reviews and court cases that found no evidence of widespread issues. ‘I think in order to listen to people and to heal our nation — to answer those grievances — that there should be either an investigation or a commission to look into that,’ she said. ‘There was fraud. There were irregularities. There were states that did not follow their state law, and/or election officials violated state law. I think all of those things are worthwhile to address so that everyone has faith and confidence and trust in the election system.’” [Quad-City Times, 1/13/21]

Quad-City Times: Miller-Meeks Gave “Credence To The False Claims Of Widespread Voting Irregularities” And Called For An Investigation Into Voter Fraud In The Biden Election. “Miller-Meeks voted Wednesday to reject a challenge to Biden’s Electoral College victory, believing Congress did not have the constitutional authority to overturn state election results. But, on Thursday Miller-Meeks continued to give credence to the false claims of widespread voting irregularities. ‘I think in order to listen to people and to heal our nation — to answer those grievances — that there should be either an investigation or a commission to look into that,’ she said. ‘There was fraud. There were irregularities. There were states that did not follow their state law, and/or election officials violated state law. I think all of those things are worthwhile to address so that everyone has faith and confidence and trust in the election system.’” [Quad-City Times, 1/7/21]

**Miller-Meeks Accepted More Than $50,000 In Campaign Contributions From Members Who Objected To The 2020 Electoral College Vote Count**

Miller-Meeks Accepted More Than $50,000 In Campaign Contributions From Members Who Objected To The 2020 Electoral College Vote Count. “In that view, Rep. Young Kim (R-CA) is out front. The Orange County conservative, who in 2020 unseated incumbent Democrat Gil Cisneros in a close race, has reported $92,000 in contributions from objectors this year, FEC data shows. Kim was followed by Reps. Miller-Meeks, Valadao, Rodney Davis (R-IL), Andrew Garbarino (R-NY), and Brian Fitzpatrick (R-PA), who have all accepted more than $50,000. The group was rounded out by Reps. Ashley Hinson (R-IA), Katko, Tony Gonzalez (R-TX), Don Bacon (R-NE), and Ann Wagner (R-MO), who received the least support: $41,000.” [Daily Beast, 11/10/21]
October 2021: Miller-Meeks Appeared At Public Events With Trump Where He Falsely Claimed He Was The Rightful President

The Hill: Miller-Meeks Was Among The GOP Lawmakers Who “Appeared Recently With Trump At Public Events Where The Former President Has Riled The Crowd With False Claims That He's The Rightful Commander In Chief.” “Other GOP lawmakers — like Iowa Reps. Mariannette Miller-Meeks and Ashley Hinson — have appeared recently with Trump at public events where the former president has riled the crowd with false claims that he's the rightful commander in chief. Still others are pressing party leaders to make election integrity a central plank of the 2022 platform, even as many in the party are hoping to turn the page and focus on Biden's challenges.” [The Hill, 10/17/21]

CNN: Miller-Meeks “Appeared Alongside Trump As He Continued To Falsely Claim That Biden Did Not Win The White House Legitimately.” “Sen. Chuck Grassley, the longest-serving GOP senator currently in office, and Reps. Ashley Hinson and Mariannette Miller-Meeks, two freshman swing district Republicans who were vocal proponents of certifying the 2020 election results, all appeared alongside Trump as he continued to falsely claim that Biden did not win the White House legitimately.” [CNN, 10/13/21]

December 2020: Miller-Meeks Said Trump “Should Go Through All The Legal Options That Are Available To Him”

Miller-Meeks: “Just As My Opponent Is Going Through All Maneuvers […] I Think The President, President Trump Should Go Through All The Legal Options That Are Available To Him As Well.” “Asked whether Miller-Meeks recognizes Biden's win, Woolson pointed to her comments during a Dec. 4 taping of ‘Iowa Press.’ Miller-Meeks said Trump was ‘going through the legal process as my opponent is going through, but I think that all transition services should be available to President-elect Biden, that at this point in time the way that the courts have ruled and the Electoral College votes have gone, President-elect Biden will be assuming office.’ ‘But I do think that just as my opponent is going through all maneuvers, even though they jumped over the Iowa courts, I think the President, President Trump should go through all the legal options that are available to him as well,’ Miller-Meeks said.” [Quad-City Times, 12/16/20]

Comments About Elections Laws And Integrity

November 2021: Miller-Meeks Said Iowans Could Trust Election Results “Because Of The Election Law Changes We Have Made In Iowa In The Past Three Years”

November 2021: Miller-Meeks: “Because Of The Election Law Changes We Have Made In Iowa In The Past Three Years, People In Iowa Can Trust That Our Elections Are Fair.” MILLER-MEEKS: “But one thing I can say is because of the election law changes we have made in Iowa in the past three years, people in Iowa can trust that our elections are fair, they can have confidence and trust in our process, and that both parties when they talk about either on one party talking about voter suppression if you ask for voter ID, the other party saying--and I think over the weekend I heard Stacey Abrams and Terry McAuliffe running for governor of Virginia talk about the election was stolen from Stacey Abrams in Georgia when she ran for governor--that on both sides, that undermines confidence in our election system. And we need to have trust in, you know, both our election system and institutions of government that are there to help people. In Iowa, I know that we can have trust and confidence in our election system because of the changes we've made over the past three years. Other states are also putting in some election integrity measures and security measures. And those laws have been opposed and denigrated, and I don't think that's helpful for all of us. You know, to me, how do you answer election fraud? If you think there's fraud, the way to answer it, get out to vote, get out to vote in huge numbers. So, people need to turn out to vote, they need to turn out to vote in overwhelming support for the candidate that they choose to support.” [YouTube, WHO13, 11/7/21] (VIDEO) 00:04:47
Miller-Meeks: Iowans Could “Have Confidence And Trust In Our System Because Of The Election Law Changes That We Made.” “The Republican message was the same in Davenport, where Davis joined 2nd District U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks for a discussion with Iowa state Republican Sens. Roby Smith of Davenport and Chris Courmoyer of LeClaire, lawyer Alan Ostergren and University of Iowa law professor Derek Muller. ‘In Iowa, we know the system worked,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘We know that people can have confidence and trust in our system because of the election law changes that we made.’” They include Iowa’s 2017 voter ID law and ‘codifying identification process on the absentee ballot request.’” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 10/4/21]

Miller-Meeks: “When You Look At What Happens Where There Is Voter ID And People Can Trust The System, More People Vote.” “All of those things have led us to the point where we had the largest turnout in the past election cycle that we’ve had,” Miller-Meeks said. ‘I think when you look at what happens where there is voter ID and people can trust the system, more people vote, and that includes in low-income and minority areas as well.’” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 10/4/21]

Miller-Meeks Said She Supported Iowa’s Tighter Absentee Ballot Deadlines And Voter ID Laws, The Latter Of Which She Called “Highly Supported By The Public”

Miller-Meeks Said Voter ID Laws Were “Highly Supported By The Public” And That “Iowans Can Have Great Confidence And Trust In Their Election System.” “HOST: A recent Iowa poll showed that 32% of Iowans and almost half of Iowans who voted for Donald Trump say they are not confident that the next election results will be, that they can trust the next election results. So there is obviously an attitude out there about a lack of confidence in our elections that has been building off of this. What will it take to convince those Americans that these elections can be trusted? MILLER-MEEKS: Well I think one thing that’s not helpful is to have a bill going through Congress that is put forward by the majority party to get rid of voter ID. The election bill that now is, they’re looking at perhaps changing that in the Senate, and concentrating on the election bill rather than on Build Back Better because at this point in time they don’t have the votes to pass that through the Senate. That getting rid of voter ID, which is highly supported by the public, so you have over 70% of the public supports voter ID. We have voter ID here within the state of Iowa, and if you look at our elections here within the state of Iowa I think Iowans can have great confidence and trust in their election system. So we have put through election law changes in order to secure elections and precisely for that reason, so that people have the confidence that their vote counts. And if anything could tell you your vote counts, it would be my election. So I am probably the poster child. But I think what we did with election law changes, the fact that our voter ID was upheld by our Supreme Court, and then we were told for absentee ballot requests that we needed to codify those changes, those changes were codified. I think in Iowa people can have trust and faith in their elections.” [YouTube, Iowa Press, 12/17/21] (VIDEO) 00:12:23

- **Miller-Meeks Said That While She Did Not Think Mail-In And Absentee Ballots Needed To Be Eliminated, She Did Support Iowa’s Requirement Of Requiring Driver’s License Or Voter Identification Numbers.** “HOST: So much of when those complaints or concerns are raised a lot of it is often around mail-in voting, absentee, early voting. Can we still have that system in place and be able to convince people that that is a safe and fair way to conduct elections? Or do you think mail-in voting needs to be constrained if not eliminated? MILLER-MEEKS: I don’t think it needs to be eliminated, I think the process that we have in Iowa where you request a mail-in ballot or you have an absentee ballot request and you request it and then you have your signature and you have either your driver’s license number or your voter identification number, that process I think works extremely well in Iowa and it’s well accepted by the public. And then being able to mail in the ballots, and because we have codified what’s expected, people know it’s expected in Iowa. So we know that your ballot has to be postmarked or barcoded, and had to adapt to that. We had to adapt to changes in postal service delivery. But it has to be barcoded or it has to be postmarked by the day before the election.” [YouTube, Iowa Press, 12/17/21] (VIDEO) 00:12:23 – 00:13:54

- **Miller-Meeks: “And If You’re Concerned About Election Fraud, The Best Thing To Do Is To Get More People Out To Vote.”** “HOST: A recent Iowa poll showed that 32% of Iowans and almost half of Iowans who
voted for Donald Trump say they are not confident that the next election results will be, that they can trust the next election results. So there is obviously an attitude out there about a lack of confidence in our elections that has been building off of this. What will it take to lower those numbers, especially given that every review, legal challenge, etc., non-partisan reviews, has shown that the election was conducted fairly and legally? What will it take to convince those Americans that these elections can be trusted? MILLER-MEEKS: Well I think one thing that's not helpful is to have a bill going through Congress that is put forward by the majority party to get rid of voter ID. The election bill that now is, they’re looking at perhaps changing that in the Senate, and concentrating on the election bill rather than on Build Back Better because at this point in time they don’t have the votes to pass that through the Senate. [...] But I think what we did with election law changes, the fact that our voter ID was upheld by our Supreme Court, and then we were told for absentee ballot requests that we needed to codify those changes, those changes were codified. I think in Iowa people can have trust and faith in their elections. And if you’re concerned about election fraud, the best thing to do is to get more people out to vote. So get out to vote in bigger and greater numbers.” [YouTube, Iowa Press, 12/17/21] (VIDEO) 00:10:10 - 00:12:23

- **Miller-Meeks Said Campaigns Could “Reach Out To Individuals” And Follow Up To Address Concerns Following Iowa’s Adoption Of Requiring Ballots Arrive To The County Auditor’s Office By Election Day.** “HOST: Actually the new law is that it has to be in the county auditor’s office on election day. MILLER-MEEKS: Yeah. So I think those, because this just came in our most recent iteration of election law changes, and there are other states that have that as well. But knowing that I think helps people to know what they have to do, campaigns can reach out to individuals and they can follow up on that and make sure people understand the law. But I don’t think mail-in ballots or absentee ballot requests with a mail-in ballot should be eliminated.” [YouTube, Iowa Press, 12/17/21] (VIDEO) 00:12:23 – 00:13:54

- **Miller-Meeks: Iowans Losing Faith In The Voting System “Can Have Confidence And Trust In The Election System Within Iowa” With The Implementation Of “Safeguards” To Prevent Fraud.** “HOST: So just before we move on, what would be your message to those, that 32% of Iowans, half of the Iowans who voted for Donald Trump, who don’t have faith in the current system, what would your message be to them? MILLER-MEEKS: My message would be that they can have confidence and trust in the election system within Iowa. We have put safeguards in place to both prevent fraud, even though it’s usually extremely low and is very difficult to prove, and that if they’re concerned about fraud, get more people out to vote.” [YouTube, Iowa Press, 12/17/21] (VIDEO) 00:13:54 - 00:14:20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>January 2021: Miller-Meeks Said She Supported Republican Proposals For A “Federal Baseline” For Vote-By-Mail And The Possibility Of Nationally Adopting Voter ID Laws</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>January 2021: Miller-Meeks Said That Without “A Federal Baseline” For Absentee Ballots And Signature Verification, “There Will Still Be Suspicion That It Was An Election That Had Irregularities.”</strong> “Miller-Meeks called for ‘a federal baseline’ for absentee ballots cast by mail and signature verification. ‘It has to be looked into,’ she said of how some states conducted elections during a pandemic. ‘And, if we don't do that, then there will still be suspicion that it was an election that had irregularities.’ At the same time, Miller-Meeks is objecting to a challenge filed by Democrat Rita Hart with the U.S. House contesting the election results in southeast Iowa's 2nd Congressional District, which includes Scott, Clinton and Muscatine counties.” [Quad-City Times, 1/7/21]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>December 2020: Miller-Meeks Signed A Letter Calling For A House Investigation Into “Voting Regulations,” Which She Said Was In Error, Then Refused To Offer A Stance On The Effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>December 2020: Miller-Meeks Signed A Letter Calling For A House Investigation Into “Voting Regulations.”</strong> “Under your leadership over the past several years, the House has demonstrated a zest for all sorts of investigations, and we believe that you have the strong capacity to initiate a thorough investigation into these voting irregularities,’ the signed letter to House Speaker Nancy Pelosi, D-California, reads. When it was first posted Tuesday night, the letter initially included Mariannette Miller-Meeks as its 24th signature, but Miller-Meeks' campaign said Wednesday morning that they'd never agreed to sign onto it. When asked Wednesday whether...”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Miller-Meeks supports the investigation, Eric Woolson, the campaign's spokesperson, repeated that she hadn't signed the letter but declined to comment on Miller-Meeks' stance on the investigation.” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 12/16/20]

- **Miller-Meeks’ Campaign Said Her Signing Onto A Letter Calling For A House Investigation Into Irregularities In The 2020 Election Was “An Error By The Office Of Rep. Cammack.”** “Republican Congresswoman-elect Mariannette Miller-Meeks’ campaign said she was mistakenly added to a letter signed by 25 other Republican representatives-elect calling on the U.S. House to investigate irregularities in the 2020 presidential election. Miller-Meeks campaign on Wednesday said she did not sign and did not agree to be included on the letter sent to U.S. House Speaker Nancy Pelosi, D-Calif., asking Congress to ‘thoroughly investigate’ unsubstantiated claims of voter fraud. U.S. Rep.-elect Kat Cammack, R-Fla., who led the letter, sent out a corrected version Wednesday morning that removed Miller-Meeks' name. ‘She didn't agree to sign on to that. That was an error by the office of Rep. Cammack,’ Miller-Meeks campaign spokesman Eric Woolson said. Asked whether Miller-Meeks supports her Republican colleagues' push, Woolson said, ‘she didn't sign the letter so I think that speaks for itself.”’ [Quad-City Times, 12/16/20]

- **Despite Claiming Her Signature Had Been An Error, Miller-Meeks’ Campaign Refused To Clarify Whether She Supported The Effort, Despite Being Asked “Maybe Five Times.”** “The campaign will not clarify whether @millermeeks supports her Republican colleague's push. I asked the question to Eric Woolson, spox for the @millermeeks , maybe five times. He just repeated that she didn't sign the letter.” [Twitter, @ZacharyOS, 12/16/20]

---

**January 6th Insurrection**

**In Response To The January 6th Insurrection, Miller-Meeks Said, “I Think There Is Plenty Of Blame To Go Around To All Of Us,” Criticized Democrats, And Defended Trump’s Comments**

Miller-Meeks: Trump’s Comments About The January 6 Insurrection “Did Not Rise To The Level Of Inciting Violence” And Counted As “Protected Free Speech.” “Republican U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks defended her support of an independent commission examining the Jan. 6 Capitol riot during a meeting with area conservatives Wednesday. […] But Miller-Meeks pushed back, saying she thought the effort actually could have benefited the former president, whom Democrats have said incited the chaos. ‘I think it's important to establish the timeline,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘And the timeline is something that could help President Trump. I did not vote to impeach President Trump, because constitutionally I felt that he had protected free speech under the Constitution. It did not rise to the level of inciting violence.”’ [Des Moines Register, 6/9/21]

Miller-Meeks: Some Of The “Failures In Leadership” That Led To The January 6th Insurrection “May Rest At The Feet Of Democrats.” “Asked how voters in Iowa's 2nd District will react to her vote, especially Republican voters in Scott County, where the former county GOP chairman was forced to step down after criticizing Trump's comments leading up to the violent Jan. 6 insurrection on the U.S. Capitol, Miller-Meeks said she is willing to defend her decision and ‘conservative voting record on the issues that are important to Republican voters. ‘I think that most Republicans, had they seen the Capitol police as I had seen them and the violence that ensued,’ (in which rioters brutally beat police, broke in through windows and doors and hunted for lawmakers as they fled), ‘would also want to get to the bottom of this,’ she said. ‘We need to know where there were failures in leadership. And some of those failures ... may rest at the feet of Democrats. And so I think it's very important to have those questions answered.”’ [Quad-City Times, 5/20/21]

**Quad-City Times: Letter To The Editor: Miller-Meeks’ “Particularly Disturbing” Response To The January 6th Insurrection Should Have Been “A Whole Lot More Forceful.”** “We are all affected when domestic terrorists stage a deadly coup on our democracy. We do not all react the same. The response of U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks seems particularly disturbing. Her televised remarks last week included these words: ‘We’d strongly encourage people to disperse and to peacefully protest in another part of the capitol...’ When our
capitol building has been breached, the safety of our entire Congress placed in jeopardy, and our democratic form of
government assaulted while in session, I expect, no demand, that anyone representing me in Washington be a
whole lot more forceful than, ‘Now boys, just be nice and go play somewhere else.’ ‘Strongly encourage’ should
have been ‘demand’. ‘People’ should read ‘terrorists’; ‘peacefully protest’ should be labeled what it is, ‘an act of
insurrection’. And what of ‘another part of the capitol’ — the Supreme Court, the vice-president’s home, the
treasury….? How about ‘jail’?” [Quad-City Times, Letter to the Editor, 1/16/21]

January 2021: In Response To The January 6th Insurrection, Miller-Meeks Said, “I Think There Is Plenty Of
Blame To Go Around To All Of Us.” “While continuing to condemn the mob violence that gripped the U.S.
Capitol Wednesday, freshman Iowa Republican U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks on Thursday suggested
President Trump and congressional Republicans should not be held accountable for stoking the violence. And while
recognizing Democrat Joe Biden as president-elect, Miller-Meeks insisted ‘there was fraud’ in the 2020 presidential
election, despite a series of reviews and court cases that found no evidence of widespread issues. ‘I think there is
plenty of blame to go around to all of us,’ Miller-Meeks told the Quad-City Times of the ‘feeling of helplessness
and powerlessness and hopelessness’ Americans feel, fueled by a pandemic, racial turmoil and a contested
presidential election, that has led to unrest across the nation.” [Quad-City Times, 1/7/21]

HEADLINE: Quad-City Times: “Miller-Meeks: Trump Should Stay And 'Plenty Of Blame To Go Around'
For US Capitol Riot.” [Quad-City Times, 1/7/21]

Miller-Meeks Voted Against Objecting To The Counting Of 2020 Electoral Votes From Pennsylvania. In
January 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against the “Rep. Perry, R-Pa., and Sen. Hawley, R-Mo., objection to the
counting of electoral votes from the state of Pennsylvania during the joint session of Congress, on the grounds that
they were not, under all of the known circumstances, regularly given.” The objection was rejected, 138-282. [House
Vote #11, 1/7/21; CQ. 1/7/21]

Miller-Meeks Voted Against Objecting To The Counting Of 2020 Electoral Votes From Arizona. In January
2021, Miller-Meeks voted against the “Rep. Gosar, R-Ariz., and Sen. Cruz, R-Texas, objection to the counting of
electoral votes from the state of Arizona during the joint session of Congress, on the grounds that they were not,
under all of the known circumstances, regularly given.” The objection was rejected, 121-303. [House Vote #10,
1/6/21; CQ. 1/6/21]

Miller-Meeks Voted Against Tabling The Motion To Refer The House Rules Package To A Select Committee
against a “Hoyer, D-Md., motion to table (kill) the Davis, R-Ill., motion to refer the resolution to a select committee
composed of the majority and minority leaders with instructions to report it back to the House with an amendment
that would require the House Administration Committee to report to the House no later than Jan. 31, 2021, a bill
related to federal election administration. It would require the bill to state that states have ‘primary authority’ to
direct elections and that Congress ‘proper role’ is to provide support to states and ‘ensure fair administration of
and voter confidence in’ the administration of federal elections. It would also require the bill to include provisions
that would extend federal baseline standards for ballot signature verification, ‘promote certainty’ in election results
and provide for oversight of the use of federal funds to administer federal elections.” The motion was agreed to,
214-196. [H. Res. 8, Vote #5, 1/4/21; CQ. 1/4/21]

- Roll Call: The Motion, A “GOP Delay Tactic,” Would Have Stated The States Held “Primary Authority
To Conduct Elections For Federal Office” And Congress’ Role Was “Secondary.” “Republicans then
offered a motion that would have added language on election oversight and administration that acknowledges
‘the primary authority to conduct elections for federal office is reserved to the states and that the Congress’s
role is secondary’ but establishes federal oversight standards for mail-in ballots. Hoyer also moved to table that
motion, which was agreed to, 214-196. ‘It’s disappointing House Democrats have completely dismissed the first opportunity to work together in the new Congress to instill voter confidence and protect the integrity of our election process,’ said House Administration ranking member Rodney Davis of Illinois, the Republican who offered the original motion. After more than two hours of GOP delay tactics that Democrats rejected, the floor debate began.” [Roll Call, 1/4/21]

US News: Miller-Meeks Was “Among The Minority Of House Republicans Who Voted Against Trump’s Groundless Effort To Invalidate Electoral College Votes” Hours After The January 6th Insurrection. “‘For Democrats to somehow change their tune in a matter of weeks over how sacrosanct an election certificate is is the height of hypocrisy,’ said Illinois Rep. Rodney Davis, top Republican on the House Administration panel. Davis and Miller-Meeks were among the minority of House Republicans who voted against Trump’s groundless effort to invalidate Electoral College votes won by now-President Joe Biden. Those roll calls occurred hours after Trump supporters’ tried disrupting that process with the Jan. 6 attack on the Capitol, which left five people dead.” [US News & World Report, 3/24/21]

Miller-Meeks Had Previously Said “I Have Suspicions About The Integrity Of The Votes Cast In Several States” In Her Statement Released On The Scheduled Vote To Certify

Miller-Meeks: “I Have Suspicions About The Integrity Of The Votes Cast In Several States.” “Today, January 6th, 2021, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02) issued the following statement regarding the scheduled vote to certify the electoral votes of the 2020 presidential election: ‘Along with many Iowans, I have serious concerns about how elections were conducted in some states and outraged at abuses of the election systems in those states. Such abuses undermine election integrity and trust in the system of that state, and more broadly those actions have affected the presidential election. I share the disappointment of millions of Iowans and Americans with the outcome of the presidential election results. I have suspicions about the integrity of the votes cast in several states, the mass mailing of ballots to every name on the voter rolls which are not up-to-date, the allegations of a lack of a chain of custody of their election materials, and the actions of elections boards and courts assuming authority beyond what is granted to them in a state’s constitution or by their legislatures.” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 1/6/21]

Miller-Meeks Said She Knew Her Decision To Certify The Electoral College Count Would “Disappoint And Anger My Supporters” And She Respected Her “Patriotic” Colleagues Who Voted Against Certification

Miller-Meeks Said That While She Would Vote To Accept The State-Certified Electors, She Respected “That My Patriotic Colleagues’ Actions Are Principled And Based On Their Interpretation Of The Constitution.” “I respect that my patriotic colleagues’ actions are principled and based on their interpretation of the Constitution, knowing that it would not change the outcome of the presidential election. And it is for that reason that we desperately need intensive oversight into election irregularities. As Republicans, we voted on measures such as providing a federal baseline to ballots cast by mail, signature verification, and the reaffirmation that states have the primary role to run elections, supporting both the concept of federalism and the Electoral College. Adoption of voter ID, which we have passed and secured in Iowa, both on election day and on absentee ballot request forms, also merits consideration and debate. To me the text of the Constitution is clear: states select electors, Congress does not. As a Member of Congress who wants to limit the power of the federal government, I must respect the states’ authority here. I understand this decision will disappoint and anger my supporters, but I have sworn an oath to support and defend the Constitution above myself. Therefore, I will vote to accept the state-certified electors.” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 1/6/21]

Miller-Meeks Said She Knew The Decision To Certify The Electoral College Count Would “Disappoint And Anger My Supporters.” “Miller-Meeks in her statement said she respects ‘that my patriotic colleagues' actions are principled and based on their interpretation of the Constitution, knowing that it would not change the outcome of the presidential election. And it is for that reason that we desperately need intensive oversight into election irregularities.’ Miller-Meeks said she supports Republican measures that provide a federal baseline to ballots cast by mail and signature verification, and that state adoption of voter ID laws like Iowa's ‘merits consideration and
debate.’ ‘I understand this decision will disappoint and anger my supporters, but I have sworn an oath to support and defend the Constitution above myself,’ Miller-Meeks said.” [Quad-City Times, 1/5/21]

**2021: Miller-Meeks Voted For Establishing A Bipartisan Commission To Investigate The January 6th Attack On The US Capitol**

May 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted For A Bill Establishing A Bipartisan Commission To Investigate The January 6th Attack On The US Capitol. In May 2021, Miller-Meeks voted for: “Passage of the bill that would establish a national commission to investigate facts and causes related to the Jan. 6, 2021, "domestic terrorist attack" on the U.S. Capitol; examine and evaluate evidence developed by relevant federal, state and local governmental agencies; and build upon the investigations of other entities. It would require the commission to investigate facts and circumstances of the attack related to intelligence and law enforcement agency activities and factors contributing to the attack, including online platforms and foreign influence operations; identify and analyze the causes of and lessons learned from the attack with regard to law enforcement operations and security protocol at the Capitol; and submit to the president and Congress reports containing findings and recommendations for corrective measures that are agreed to by a majority of the commission. The commission would be composed of ten members, evenly chosen by the majority and minority parties, who have national recognition and significant experience in at least two subject areas related to the attack, such as law enforcement, intelligence, law, civil rights and counterterrorism. Among other provisions, the bill would authorize the commission to issue subpoenas and hold hearings and specify that the commission would submit its final report by the end of 2021 and terminate 60 days after submitting the report.” The bill passed 252-175. [H R 3233, Vote #154, 5/19/21; CQ, 5/19/21]

- **Miller-Meeks Was The Only Iowa House Republican To Vote To Establish A Bipartisan Commission To Investigate The January 6th Attack On The U.S. Capitol.** “One of the three Iowa Republicans serving in the U.S. House voted for establishing a commission to investigate the January 6 attack on the U.S. Capitol. Second District Congresswoman Mariannette Miller-Meeks of Ottumwa was one of 35 Republicans in the House who voted for creation of a bipartisan commission to examine the events of January 6th. Miller-Meeks has not issued a statement about her vote.” [Radio Iowa, 5/20/21]

**Miller-Meeks Said Her Vote To Establish An Independent Commission Was A Vote To Support The Capitol Police And That The Commission “Could Help President Trump” Despite Trump’s Public Criticism**

Miller-Meeks Said That When She Voted For The Independent Commission She Was “Supporting The Rank-And-File Capitol Police.” “Miller-Meeks said she was called a ‘traitor’ and a ‘RINO (Republican In Name Only)’ by ‘a small portion of individuals’ for joining Democrats and 34 other Republican House members to back legislation to create an independent, bipartisan commission to investigate the Jan. 6 attack on the U.S. Capitol. ‘I was supporting the rank-and-file Capitol Police,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘Mostly, I wanted to know why there was a breach of security, and at whose level? Because, we've never been able to ask questions of all of those individuals in leadership who were terminated or forced to resign immediately.’ Miller-Meeks said she felt it was the ‘rational, pragmatic thing to do.’ ‘I was very concerned if this commission, with equal representation (from both parties) ... and an end date, did not go through that (House Speaker) Nancy Pelosi would set up her own commission and it would be another partisan, political hack job. I was right.’” [Quad-City Times, 6/26/21]

Miller-Meeks Said The January 6th Commission Was “Something That Could Help President Trump.” “Republican U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks defended her support of an independent commission examining the Jan. 6 Capitol riot during a meeting with area conservatives Wednesday. […] But Miller-Meeks pushed back, saying she thought the effort actually could have benefited the former president, whom Democrats have said incited the chaos. ‘I think it's important to establish the timeline,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘And the timeline is something that could help President Trump. I did not vote to impeach President Trump, because constitutionally I felt that he had protected free speech under the Constitution. It did not rise to the level of inciting violence.’” [Des Moines Register, 6/9/21]
Miller-Meeks Said She Voted For The Commission To Have “A More Fair, Bipartisan Process” With “The Ability To Have Subpoena Power.” “Miller-Meeks told the Quad-City Times in an interview Thursday ‘we need to make sure something like this never happens again.’ ‘There is a great amount of concern of the security breach and the lack of security’ at the Capitol, Miller-Meeks said. ‘A lot of blame has been laid at the feet of Capitol police, and I felt that in order to support the Capitol police, a bipartisan commission ... having the ability to have subpoena power was important.’ Miller-Meeks added while investigations into the Jan. 6 insurrection are underway by congressional committees with Democratic majorities, ‘I thought a more fair, bipartisan process where there is equal representation would be important.’” [Daily Nonpareil, 5/21/21]

New York Post: Trump “Blasted” Miller-Meeks And Other Republicans Who Voted To Establish A January 6 Commission, “Suggesting It Would Cost Them Support From His Base.” “Former President Donald Trump on Thursday blasted the 35 House Republicans that voted in favor of establishing a commission to investigate the Jan. 6 siege on the Capitol, suggesting it would cost them support from his base. […] GOP Reps. French Hill (Ark.), Steve Womack (Ark.) David Valadao (Calif.) Carlos Gimenez (Fla.), Maria Salazar (Fla.), Mike Simpson (Idaho) Rodney Davis (Ill.), Kinzinger (Ill.), Trey Hollingsworth (Ind.), Mariannette Miller-Meeks (Iowa) Peter Meijer (Mich.), Fred Upton (Mich.), Michael Guest (Miss.), Jeff Fortenberry (Neb.), Don Bacon (Neb.), Chris Smith (N.J.), Andrew Garbarino (N.Y.), Tom Reed (N.Y.), Katko, Chris Jacobs (N.Y.), Dave Joyce (Ohio), Anthony Gonzalez (Ohio), Stephanie Bice (Okla.), Cliff Bentz (Or.), Brian Fitzpatrick (Pa.), Tom Rice (S.C.), Dusty Johnson (S.D.), Van Taylor (Texas), Tony Gonzales (Texas), Blake Moore (Utah), John Curtis (Utah), Jaime Herrera Beutler (Wash.), Dan Newhouse (Wash.), David McKinley (W.V.) and Cheney voted in favor of the bill.” [New York Post, 5/20/21]

**2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Establishing A Select Committee To Investigate The January 6th Attack Following The Failure To Establish A Bipartisan Commission**

June 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Establishment Of The Select Committee To Investigate The January 6 Attack On The US Capitol. In June 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against: “Agreeing to the resolution that would establish a special committee in the House of Representatives to investigate facts and causes related to the Jan. 6, 2021, ‘domestic terrorist attack’ on the U.S. Capitol; examine and evaluate evidence developed by relevant federal, state and local governmental agencies; and build upon the investigations of other entities. It would require the committee to investigate facts and circumstances of the attack related to intelligence and law enforcement agency activities and factors contributing to the attack, including online platforms and foreign influence operations; identify and analyze the causes of and lessons learned from the attack with regard to law enforcement operations and security protocol at the Capitol; and submit to Congress reports including findings and conclusions of its investigations, legislative recommendations, and recommendations for corrective measures. The resolution would authorize the speaker of the House to appoint 13 members to the committee, including five members after consultation with the minority leader. Among other provisions, it would authorize the committee chair to issue subpoenas, authorize such sums as may be necessary for committee expenses, and specify that the committee would terminate 30 days after filing its final report to Congress.” The bill passed 222 to 190. [H. Res. 503, Vote #197, 6/30/21; CQ, 6/30/21]

- **The Select Committee Was Established After Senate Republicans Blocked A Vote On Creating A Bipartisan Outside Commission To Investigate The January 6th Insurrection.** “In a largely party-line vote, the Democratic-controlled House of Representatives approved legislation on Wednesday to create a select committee to launch a new inquiry into the Jan. 6 attack on the U.S. Capitol. With a larger share of Republicans voting against the plan, it marks the latest turn in a partisan fight to investigate the riot […] Last month, Senate Republicans blocked a move to vote on an outside commission, leaving Democratic leaders with plans to move forward with a House select committee instead. But some Republicans who supported the independent commission voted against the select committee.” [NPR, 6/30/21]

- **Miller-Meeks And The Other Two Iowa Republican Representatives Voted Against Establishing A Select Committee To Investigate The January 6th Insurrection.** “The U.S. House voted Wednesday to establish a
select committee to investigate the Jan. 6 insurrection, in which a mob of pro-Trump supporters attacked the U.S. Capitol. In a 222-190 vote that was almost entirely party-line, just two Republicans joined Democrats in passing the resolution, which calls for a probe into ‘one of the darkest days of our democracy.’ The two were Reps. Liz Cheney of Wyoming and Adam Kinzinger of Illinois. Nineteen Republicans did not vote. Iowa’s three Republican representatives, Randy Feenstra, Ashley Hinson, and Mariannette Miller-Meeks, voted against the resolution. Democratic Rep. Cindy Axne voted for it.” [Iowa Capital Dispatch, 6/30/21]

Miller-Meeks Said That A January 6th Select Committee Would Be “Another Partisan, Political Hack Job” And Compared It To The House Investigation Of Russian Election Interference

Miller-Meeks Said She Was Worried The Select Committee To Investigate The January 6 Insurrection Would “Become Another Political Partisan Exercise Such As We Saw With The Russian Collusion Hoax.” “U.S. Representative for Iowa’s 2nd District Mariannette Miller-Meeks was one of 35 House Republicans that voted in favor of that legislation. She shares her thoughts on Pelosi’s plans to further investigate the Capitol attack that resulted in six deaths, ‘I’ve always believed that we must get to the bottom of what happened that day and that having a more neutral bipartisan commission with equal representation would have ensured that it was not a political partisan process. So with the creation of a select committee I’m worried that it will become another political partisan exercise such as we saw with the Russian collusion hoax.’” [KCII, 6/29/21]

Miller-Meeks Said She Would Not Vote For A Select Committee To Investigate The January 6th Insurrection Because It Was Going To Be “Another Partisan, Political Hack Job.” “‘I was very concerned if this commission, with equal representation (from both parties) ... and an end date, did not go through that (House Speaker) Nancy Pelosi would set up her own commission and it would be another partisan, political hack job. I was right.’ Pelosi announced this week she will create a select committee to investigate the Jan. 6 attack on the Capitol after Republicans blocked the formation of an independent commission. Miller-Meeks said she will not vote for Pelosi's commission.” [Quad-City Times, 6/26/21]

July 2021: Iowa Public Radio Called Miller-Meeks’ Vote Against The Select Committee “An About-Face” Given That She Had Supported The Initial Bipartisan Commission

Iowa Public Radio: Voting Against The January 6th Select Committee Was “An About-Face By Miller-Meeks.” “Outside of sole Democratic member U.S. Rep. Cindy Axne, Iowa's Congressional delegation has not supported this new select committee to investigate the January 6 riot. U.S. Representatives Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Ashley Hinson and Randy Feenstra — Iowa’s Republican delegation to the House — voted with their party leaders against creating the committee. This was an about-face by Miller-Meeks, who voted in favor of the initial bipartisan commission blocked by her Republican colleagues in the Senate like Chuck Grassley and Joni Ernst.” [Iowa Public Radio, 7/29/21]

- Miller-Meeks Had Voted To Establish A Bipartisan Commission To Investigate The January 6th Attack On The U.S. Capitol In May 2021. “One of the three Iowa Republicans serving in the U.S. House voted for establishing a commission to investigate the January 6 attack on the U.S. Capitol. Second District Congresswoman Mariannette Miller-Meeks of Ottumwa was one of 35 Republicans in the House who voted for creation of a bipartisan commission to examine the events of January 6th. Miller-Meeks has not issued a statement about her vote.” [Radio Iowa, 5/20/21]

July 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted For A Procedural Motion In Support Of Condemning Pelosi’s Decision Not To Seat McCarthy’s Nominations For The Select Committee

Miller-Meeks Voted Against A Motion To Table A Privileged Resolution To Condemn The Refusal Of Speaker Pelosi To Seat All Five Republican Members Nominated By Minority Leader McCarthy To The Jan. 6 Select Committee. In February 2015, Miller-Meeks voted against: “Hoyer, D-Md., motion to table (kill) the privileged resolution that would condemn the refusal of Speaker Pelosi, D-Calif., to seat all five Republican
members nominated by Minority Leader McCarthy, R-Calif., to the Jan. 6 select committee and urge Pelosi to appoint the following members: Reps. Banks, R-Ind., Jordan, R-Ohio., Davis, R-Ill., Armstrong, R-N.D., and Nehls, R-Texas.” The motion was agreed to by a vote of 218-197. [H Res 554, Vote #219, 7/26/21; CQ, 7/26/21]

2021: Miller-Meeks Voted To Award Congressional Gold Medals To US Capitol Police Officers Who Defended The Capitol During The Insurrection, But Voted Against Funding Security Upgrades For Prevention Of Similar Incidents In The Future

May 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against A Bill Funding Emergency And Security Activities In Response To Jan. 6 Attack On U.S. Capitol And Security Upgrades For Future Prevention Of Similar Incidents. In May 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against: “Passage of the bill that would provide approximately $1.9 billion in emergency supplemental fiscal 2021 appropriations to legislative branch and other federal entities for security activities in response to the Jan. 6, 2021, attack on the U.S. Capitol, including approximately $753 million to reimburse costs associated with responding to the attack and approximately $990 million for legislative and judicial branch security upgrades. Within the total, it would also provide approximately $170 million for legislative branch costs associated with the COVID-19 public health emergency. For expenses related to the Jan. 6 attack and to prevent similar incidents, it would provide $520.9 million for the National Guard and funding for several law enforcement agencies, including the FBI and National Park Service. It would provide $66.8 million to the District of Columbia for public safety expenses related to terrorist threats and federal presence in the district. It would provide $79.3 million for the Capitol Police, including specified funding for employee hazard pay and retention bonuses, the employee wellness program, agreements with state and local law enforcement agencies, protective details for members of Congress, and physical protection barriers.” The bill passed 213 to 212. [H R 3237, Vote #156, 5/20/21; CQ, 5/20/21]

Miller-Meeks Voted Twice To Award Congressional Gold Medals To US Capitol Police Who Had Protected The Capitol On January 6th

June 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted For Awarding Four Congressional Gold Medals To The US Capitol Police Who Protected The Capitol On January 6, 2021. In June 2021, Miller-Meeks voted for: “Waters, D-Calif., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended, that would provide for the presentation of four congressional gold medals to the U.S. Capitol Police and those who protected the U.S. Capitol on Jan. 6, 2021. It would require the presentation of one medal each for display at the U.S. Capitol Police headquarters, D.C. Metropolitan Police Department headquarters, Smithsonian Institution and U.S. Capitol.” The motion passed 406 to 21. [H R 3325, Vote #161, 6/15/21; CQ, 6/15/21]

March 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted For Awarding Three Congressional Gold Medals To The United States Capitol Police And Those Who Protected The US Capitol On January 6, 2021. In March 2021, Miller-Meeks voted for: “Waters, D-Calif., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended, that would award three congressional gold medals to the U.S. Capitol Police and those who protected the U.S. Capitol on Jan. 6, 2021. It would require the presentation of one medal each to the U.S. Capitol Police and the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia for display at their headquarters, and one medal to the Smithsonian Institution for display and research, along with a plaque listing the other law enforcement agencies that participated in protecting the Capitol.” The motion passed 413-12. [H Res 1085, Vote #87, 3/17/21; CQ, 3/17/21]


Miller-Meeks On Frustration About January 6th Insurrectionists Awaiting Their Time In Court: “I Understand The Anger” And “We Will Have A More Fair Investigation When We Have Power.” “Miller-Meeks also spoke about the Jan. 6 Commission and said she understood the frustration expressed at the meeting about those who were charged with a federal crime and are still awaiting their time in court. ‘I understand the
anger,’ she said. ‘It is a quiet rage and we will have a solution, we will continue to push it and we will continue to investigate it. And we will have a more fair investigation when we have power.’ She urged attendees to, in a respectful manner, continue to ask questions.” [Fort Madison Daily Democrat, 1/5/22]

December 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Finding Trump’s Chief Of Staff Mark Meadows In Contempt Of Congress Following His Refusal To Comply With A Subpoena

December 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Finding Former Trump Chief Of Staff Mark Meadows In Contempt Of Congress For Refusal To Comply With A Subpoena From The January 6th Select Committee. On December 14, 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against “Agreeing to the resolution, that would find Mark Meadows, former White House chief of staff to President Donald Trump, in contempt of Congress for refusal to comply with a subpoena issued by the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol. It would direct the speaker of the House to ‘take all appropriate action to enforce the subpoena’ and certify the committee report (H Rept 117-216) accompanying the contempt resolution to the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia for judicial action.” The motion passed by a vote of 222-208. [H. Res. 851, Vote 447, 12/14/21; CQ, 12/14/21]

- Mark Meadows Provided Thousands Of Documents To The January 6th Committee But Claimed Executive Privilege And Refused To Appear Before The Panel. “Sweeping claims of executive privilege by Meadows and Trump to shield their activities on and before Jan. 6 from congressional scrutiny have been challenged in the court and by constitutional experts. Last week, Meadows backed away from cooperating with the panel just days after saying he would. He argued that the panel was pressuring him to discuss issues that the former president said are protected by executive privilege. However, Meadows had already produced thousands of documents for the panel, including text messages and emails related to the events of the day.” [Washington Post, 12/15/21]

- January 6th Committee Chairman Bennie Thompson: The Report Referring Meadows For Criminal Contempt Was “Clear And Compelling.” “The select committee’s report referring Mr. Meadows for criminal contempt charges is clear and compelling,” Committee Chairman Bennie Thompson, a Democrat from Mississippi, said on Tuesday. ‘As White House chief of staff, Mr. Meadows played a role in or was witness to key events leading up to and including the January 6th assault on the United States Capitol.’ […] Republican Rep. Liz Cheney of Wyoming, the vice chair of the select committee, said Tuesday that Meadows had received numerous text messages urging Trump to take action to stop the riot that he has produced without any privilege claim.” [CNN, 12/14/21]

October 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Finding Steve Bannon In Contempt Of Congress For Refusal To Comply With A Subpoena From The January 6th Select Committee

October 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Finding Steve Bannon In Contempt Of Congress For Refusal To Comply With A Subpoena From The January 6th Select Committee. On October 21, 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against “Agreeing to the resolution that would find Stephen Bannon, adviser to former President Donald Trump, in contempt of Congress for refusal to comply with a subpoena issued by the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol. It would direct the speaker of the House to ‘take all appropriate action to enforce the subpoena’ and certify the committee report (H Rept 117-152) accompanying the contempt resolution to the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia for judicial action.” The bill passed by a vote of 229-202. [CQ, 10/21/21; H.Res. 730, Vote 329, 10/21/21]

Impeachment
January 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Impeaching Trump For Incitement Of An Insurrection And Said Impeachment “Would Create A Bigger Wedge And Divide In Our Country”

Miller-Meeks Voted Against Impeaching Trump For Incitement Of An Insurrection. In January 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against “Adoption of the article of impeachment that would impeach President Donald Trump for incitement of insurrection by ‘inciting violence against the government of the United States.’” Specifically, it would state that Trump ‘repeatedly issued false statements’ asserting that the results of the 2020 presidential election were the product of widespread fraud and should not be accepted or certified. It would state that Trump made statements at a rally on Jan. 6, 2020, that ‘encouraged -- and foreseeably resulted in -- lawless action’ at the Capitol building during the certification of electoral college votes, during which protesters entered the Capitol, attacked law enforcement personnel, ‘menaced’ members of Congress and the vice president, and engaged in other ‘violent, deadly, destructive, and seditious acts.’ It would state that Trump's conduct on Jan. 6 followed prior efforts ‘to subvert and obstruct’ the certification of 2020 presidential election results, including during a Jan. 2 phone call during which he urged Georgia Secretary of State Brad Raffensperger to ‘find’ enough votes to overturn the state's presidential election results and ‘threatened Secretary Raffensperger if he failed to do so.’ It would state President Trump's ‘endangered the security of the United States and its institutions of government’ and that he ‘threatened the integrity of the democratic system, interfered with the peaceful transition of power, and imperiled a coordinate branch of government.’ Pursuant to the rule (H Res 41), upon adoption of the article of impeachment, the House agreed to the resolution (H Res 40) that would appoint and authorize the following impeachment trial managers to conduct the impeachment trial against President Donald Trump in the Senate: Reps. Raskin, D-Md., DeGette, D-Colo., Cicilline, D-R.I., Castro, D-Texas, Swalwell, D-Calif., Lieu, D-Calif., Plaskett, D-V.I., Neguse, D-Colo., and Dean, D-Pa.” The article of impeachment was adopted, 232-197. [H. Res. 24, Vote #17, 1/13/21; CQ, 1/13/21]

Miller-Meeks Said Impeaching Trump In January 2021 Would “Only Further Divide The Nation” And “There Are Other Ways To Hold The President Accountable”

Miller-Meeks: Impeaching Trump “With 7 Days Remaining In His Term Would Only Further Divide The Nation And Make It More Difficult For President-Elect Joe Biden To Unify And Lead Our Nation.” “WASHINGTON, D.C. – Today, January 13th, 2021, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02) issued the following statement regarding her opposition to articles of impeachment: ‘As horrific as the events of January 6 were, President Trump has conceded and committed to an orderly transition of power on January 20. Impeaching him with 7 days remaining in his term would only further divide the nation and make it more difficult for President-Elect Joe Biden to unify and lead our nation. The people of Iowa sent me to Congress to work on health care reform, lower the cost of prescription drugs, and get Iowans safely back to work. That will be my focus.’” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 1/13/21]

Miller-Meeks: Removing Trump Following The January 6th Insurrection “Would Create A Bigger Wedge And Divide In Our Country” Rather Than “Heal Our Nation.” “Iowa Republican U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, who joined Congress provisionally this week while her election is being contested, said Thursday she thinks Trump should finish out his term. Removing him, she said, wouldn't help 'heal our nation.' ‘To go through another impeachment process, I think, would create a bigger wedge and divide in our country,’ she said. ‘It is time for compassion. It is time for understanding.’” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 1/8/21]

Miller-Meeks Said “There Are Other Ways To Hold The President Accountable” Regarding Impeachment Talks Following The January 6th Insurrection. “Iowa freshman Republican U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks on Wednesday said ‘there are other ways to hold the president accountable’ for last week's deadly ‘rampage’ at the U.S. Capitol besides impeachment. ‘As horrific and devastating as the rampage on the Capitol was on Jan. 6, President Trump has conceded. He has committed to a peaceful and orderly transition of power on Jan. 20,’ Miller-Meeks said Wednesday morning, speaking on a news radio program on WMT-AM in Cedar Rapids, as the U.S. House for a second time deliberated impeaching President Donald Trump. Miller-Meeks reiterated on Wednesday that impeaching Trump a week shy of the end of his term would ‘only further divide the nation and make it more difficult for President-elect Joe Biden to unify and lead our nation.’” [Quad-City Times, 1/13/21]
HEADLINE: Quad-City Times: “Miller-Meeks: Trump Should Stay And 'Plenty Of Blame To Go Around' For US Capitol Riot.” [Quad-City Times, 1/7/21]

Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-01) Research Book

Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Resolution Calling On Vice President Pence To Invoke The 25th Amendment And Remove Trump From Office

Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Resolution Calling On Vice President Pence To Invoke The 25th Amendment And Remove Trump From Office. In January 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against “Agreeing to the resolution that would state that the House of Representatives calls on Vice President Mike Pence to use his powers under section 4 of the 25th Amendment to convene and mobilize members of the president's cabinet to declare that President Donald Trump is unable to successfully discharge the duties and powers of his office, and to transmit notice to Congress that Pence will immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as acting president. The resolution would state among its findings that Trump ‘widely advertised and broadly encouraged’ participation in the march on the U.S. Capitol on Wednesday, Jan. 6, which turned into a violent insurrectionary mob that resulted in 5 deaths following the storming of the Capitol building; did not appeal to his followers to exit the Capitol during the insurrection; refused to accept the results of the 2020 presidential election as legitimate; and made at least three attempts to intervene in the vote counting and certification process in the state of Georgia and to ‘coerce’ its state officials to declare him the winner of the state's electoral votes.” The resolution passed, 223-205. [H. Res. 41, Vote #14, 1/12/21; CQ, 1/12/21]

Miller-Meeks Voted Against Blocking Republican-Proposed Commissions Intended To “Deflect The Anger Directed At Trump” And Considered To Be Alternatives To Impeaching Trump

Miller-Meeks Voted Against Blocking A Resolution Establishing A Bipartisan 9/11-Style Commission To Investigate The January 6th Attack On The U.S. Capitol. In January 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against a “McGovern, D-Mass., motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and possibility of amendment) on the rule (H Res 41).” According to the Congressional Record, Rep. Cole stated: “Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to immediately bring up a resolution establishing a bipartisan national commission on the domestic terrorist attack on the United States Capitol. This proposed bipartisan commission will be tasked with examining and reporting upon the terror attack upon our Capitol that occurred last Wednesday. The commission will be bipartisan in nature, modeled after the 9/11 Commission, and will fully be empowered to undertake a full investigation and make recommendations to the President and to Congress. I can think of no more appropriate path for Congress to follow than by ensuring a bipartisan commission reviews all evidence and reports back to us on this horrific event.” A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of the resolution. The motion was agreed to, 221-205. [H. Res. 41, Vote #15, 1/13/21; CQ, 1/13/21]

- Republicans Proposed The Commission As An Alternative To Impeaching Trump For His Role In The January 6th Capitol Insurrection. “House Republicans argued Wednesday that instead of impeaching President Donald Trump, Congress should create a commission to study what happened last week. Modeled after the bipartisan commission that analyzed the 9/11 terrorism attacks, the body would recommend how to prevent attacks on the Capitol in the future. ‘I can think of no more appropriate path for Congress to follow,’ said Oklahoma Rep. Tom Cole, the top Republican on the House Rules Committee.” [USA Today, 1/13/21]

Miller-Meeks Voted Against Blocking A Resolution Establishing A Bipartisan 9/11-Style Commission To Investigate The January 6th Attack On The U.S. Capitol. In January 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against “Agreeing to the Scanlon, D-Pa., motion to order the previous question (thus ending the debate and possibility of amendment).” According to the Congressional Record, Rep. Cole stated: “Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to immediately bring up a resolution establishing a bipartisan national commission on the domestic terrorist attack on the United States Capitol. This commission, modeled on the 9/11 Commission, will be charged with examining and reporting upon the facts and causes relating to the attack that occurred on January 6 of 2021 and with providing appropriate findings, conclusions, and recommendations for corrective measures. I can think of no more appropriate path for Congress to follow, Mr. Speaker, than to ensure
that a bipartisan commission reviews all evidence and reports back to us on this horrific event.” A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of the resolution. The motion was agreed to, 219-206. [H. Res. 21, Vote #12, 1/12/21; CQ, 1/12/21]

Republicans Proposed The Commission In Effort To “Deflect The Anger Directed At Trump” Amid Democratic Calls For Vice President Pence To Invoke The 25th Amendment And Remove Trump From The Presidency. “The House passed on Tuesday evening a searing resolution urging Vice President Mike Pence to invoke the 25th Amendment to expel President Donald Trump for inciting the violent mob that stormed the Capitol last week […] Republicans sought to deflect the anger directed at Trump by proposing a commission to investigate the forces and causes behind the insurrection. Rep. Tom Cole, an Oklahoma Republican, called the effort to prod Pence ‘misguided and inappropriate,’ noting that the 25th Amendment gives Congress no explicit role in suggesting a vice president to declare a president unfit.” [Dallas Morning News, 1/12/21]

**Extremist Ties**

**2019: Miller-Meeks Spoke At A Rally With “Racist Provocateur And Holocaust Denier” Nick Fuentes, And Did Not Object When Fuentes Called For A “Monoculture”**

December 2019: Miller-Meeks Spoke At A Rally With Nick Fuentes, Who Marched In The Deadly 2017 Unite The Right Rally In Charlottesville, Virginia. “Nick Fuentes spoke Dec. 2 at the church during a gathering billed as an immigration forum organized by Scott County Teenage Republicans. Fuentes, who marched in the deadly 2017 Unite the Right rally in Charlottesville, Virginia, Fuentes called for development of a ‘monoculture’ in the United States and spoke against diversity in his remarks. Other speakers at the Dec. 2 gathering at the church included ‘angel families,’ family members of people killed by immigrants in the United States illegally, and Republican candidates for Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District seat, Bobby Schilling and Iowa Sen. Mariannette Miller-Meeks. Although no one objected to Fuentes’ remarks on Dec. 2, Schilling and Miller-Meeks denounced him the next day. Schilling also fired a staffer he said had coordinated Fuentes’ appearance. Michael Sisco had served for more than a month as Schilling’s ground-game coordinator.” [The Quad-City Times, 12/8/19]

- Iowa City Press-Citizen: Nick Fuentes Was A “Racist Provocateur And Holocaust Denier” Who Even Far Right Conservative Ideologues Like Ben Shapiro Considered “White Supremacist Garbage.” “This week, two Republican candidates for Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District took to Twitter to denounce Nick Fuentes, a racist provocateur and Holocaust denier, after Fuentes spoke at the same political rally in Bettendorf they appeared at. The Quad-City Times reported that both Mariannette Miller-Meeks and Bobby Schilling spoke at a forum at Pleasant View Baptist Church focused on immigration Monday night. The event hosted by the Scott County Teenage Republicans revolved around the testimonies of ‘angel parents,’ or people whose children were killed by undocumented immigrants, to advocate for more stringent immigration enforcement, construction of a wall along the United States’ border with Mexico and the hoped-for reelection of Donald Trump in 2020. Fuentes reportedly used racist arguments that decried both illegal and legal migration. Even conservative ideologues on the far right like Ben Shapiro have characterized Fuentes' views as 'white supremacist garbage,' as Shapiro described it at a Stanford University speech in November.” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 12/5/19]

**Miller-Meeks Did Not Object When Fuentes Called For Development Of A “Monoculture” In The United States And Spoke Against Diversity In His Remarks.** “Fuentes called for development of a ‘monoculture’ in the United States and spoke against diversity in his remarks. Other speakers at the Dec. 2 gathering at the church included ‘angel families,’ family members of people killed by immigrants in the United States illegally, and Republican candidates for Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District seat, Bobby Schilling and Iowa Sen. Mariannette Miller-Meeks. Although no one objected to Fuentes’ remarks on Dec. 2, Schilling and Miller-Meeks denounced him the next day. Schilling also fired a staffer he said had coordinated Fuentes’ appearance. Michael Sisco had served for more than a month as Schilling’s ground-game coordinator.” [The Quad-City Times, 12/8/19]
Miller-Meeks Denounced Fuentes The Next Day, Saying She Had Not Been Aware Who He Was Or What He Represented, But Some Felt She Had “Condemned Fuentes, But Not His Ideas”

Miller-Meeks Denounced Fuentes The Next Day. “Fuentes called for development of a ‘monoculture’ in the United States and spoke against diversity in his remarks. Other speakers at the Dec. 2 gathering at the church included ‘angel families,’ family members of people killed by immigrants in the United States illegally, and Republican candidates for Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District seat, Bobby Schilling and Iowa Sen. Mariannette Miller-Meeks. Although no one objected to Fuentes’ remarks on Dec. 2, Schilling and Miller-Meeks denounced him the next day. Schilling also fired a staffer he said had coordinated Fuentes’ appearance. Michael Sisco had served for more than a month as Schilling’s ground-game coordinator.” [The Quad-City Times, 12/8/19]

- Cedar Rapids Gazette Columnist Lyz Lenz: Following Her Event Appearance With Neo-Nazi Nick Fuentes, Miller-Meeks “Condemned Fuentes, But Not His Ideas.” “But while King may be gone, the reality is that racism is endemic among elected leaders in Iowa, it just hides behind a nicer veneer. In December of 2019, Republican candidate for congress in Iowa's 2nd District, Mariannette Miller-Meeks, appeared alongside neo-Nazi Nick Fuentes at an anti-immigration event in Bettendorf. Miller Meeks later condemned Fuentes, but not his ideas.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, Lyz Lenz Column, 6/10/20]

Miller-Meeks Said She Was Not Aware Who Fuentes Was Or Represented. “The Press-Citizen reached out to Miller-Meeks and Bobbi Schilling for context on their attendance at the forum. ‘I've spent my life and career trying to treat everyone with the same respect that I would want to be treated with,' Miller-Meeks said in a release. ‘As I said yesterday (on Twitter), I wasn’t aware who Nick Fuentes was or what he represented. Had I known, I would not have attended and I certainly would have encouraged the Scott County Teenage Republicans to cancel his appearance.’” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 12/5/19]

Miller-Meeks: “There Is No Room In This Country For Racism, Antisemitism, Xenophobia And Hate.” “There is no room in this country for racism, antisemitism, xenophobia and hate,” Miller-Meeks tweeted Tuesday. ‘I have been a long supporter of Israel and celebrate people of all backgrounds.’” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 12/5/19]

Fuentes Was Later Involved In The January 6th Insurrection And Was Subpoenaed By The January 6th Select Committee In January 2022 To Testify On His Role

January 2022: Fuentes Was Subpoenaed By The January 6th Select Committee For His Involvement In The January 6th Insurrection. “The panel investigating the Jan. 6 insurrection on Wednesday subpoenaed two fringe far-right figures, known for spreading misinformation about the results of the 2020 election and urging Republicans to overturn it. Nick Fuentes, a head of the extremist America First movement, has gained prominence by agitating false claims about election fraud and was on Capitol grounds on Jan. 6, 2021, although there’s no evidence he entered the building. Fuentes, a white nationalist who celebrated the attack in its aftermath, notably hosted Rep. Paul Gosar (R-Ariz.) as a keynote speaker at a conference last year, just weeks after the attack.” [Politico, 1/19/22]

2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Removing Rep. Marjorie Taylor Greene From Her Committee Assignments

February 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Removing Rep. Marjorie Taylor Greene From Her Committee Assignments. In February 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against: “Agreeing to the resolution that would remove Rep. Marjorie Taylor Greene, R-Ga., from the House Budget and Education and Labor committees. It would state that, under the rules of the House, members and employees must "behave at all times in a manner that shall reflect creditably on the House" and that Rep. Greene should be removed "in light of conduct she has exhibited."’” The resolution passed 230 to 199. [H Res 72, Vote #25, 2/4/21; CQ, 2/4/21]
Disinformation Prevention

2022: Miller-Meeks On Biden’s Call For Social Media And Media Outlets To Curb Misinformation: “That Then Should Include Your Own Disinformation”

Miller-Meeks On Biden’s Call For Social Media And Media Outlets To Curb Misinformation: “That then should include your own disinformation! But social media companies and their algorithms are NOT ‘source matter experts’ and should not be ‘encouraged’ to censor by the federal government.” QUOTE TWEET @Forbes: “President Biden: ‘I make a special appeal to social media companies and media outlets: please, deal with the misinformation and disinformation that's on your shows.’” [Twitter, @millermeeeks, 1/13/22]

2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Prohibiting Deepfakes And Establishing Disclosure Requirements For Digital Political Advertising

December 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Amendments To Protect Election Officials Who Receive Threats Related To Their Service, Prohibit The President, Vice President, And Cabinet From Contracting With The Federal Government, Establish Disclosure Requirements For Digital Political Advertising, And Other Provisions. On December 9, 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against the “Carolyn B. Maloney, D-N.Y., en bloc amendments no. 1 that would include 31 amendments to the bill that would, among other provisions, establish protections for personally identifiable information of election officials who they have received threats related to their service; prohibit the president, vice president and cabinet members from contracting with the federal government; direct the Federal Election Commission to issue guidance for political committees on cybersecurity risks; establish an inspector general for the Office of Management and Budget; establish disclosure requirements for internet and digital political advertising; prohibit the use of deepfakes, or materially deceptive audio or visual media, of a federal election candidate; impose various limitations on national emergency powers; extend whistleblower protections to fellows or interns at federal agencies; and codify an executive order requiring all executive branch personnel to sign an ethics pledge.” The amendment bloc was adopted by a vote of 218-211. [HR 5314, Vote 436, 12/9/21; CQ, 12/9/21]

2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Requiring Disclaimers On Online Material Distributed On Behalf Of A Foreign Entity

March 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Requiring Disclaimers On Online Material Distributed On Behalf Of A Foreign Entity And Requiring Polling Locations To Operate For Four Hours Outside Of Business Hours. In March 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against: “Lofgren, D-Calif., en bloc amendments no. 4 that would, among other provisions, require conspicuous disclaimers when any informational material on an online platform is distributed on behalf of a foreign entity; require online platforms to generate a public record of political advertisements; require states to run polling locations that are open for at least four hours outside of the period between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.; and require the Government Accountability Office's to assess the extent to which the small-contribution public financing program established by the bill increases opportunities for candidates of diverse racial, gender and socioeconomic backgrounds.” The motion was agreed to by a vote of 223 - 208. [HR 1, Vote #58, 3/3/21; CQ, 3/3/21]

2021: Miller-Meeks Voted For Removing A Provision To Create National Strategy To Protect Democratic Institutions From Cyber Attacks And Disinformation Campaigns

March 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted For Removing A Provision To Create National Strategy To Protect Democratic Institutions From Cyber Attacks And Disinformation Campaigns. In March 2021, Miller-Meeks voted for: “Davis, R-Ill., amendment no. 19 that would strike from the bill a section that would require the creation of a national strategy to protect against cyber attacks, influence operations, disinformation campaigns and other
activities that could undermine the security and integrity of U.S. democratic institutions, and that would establish a commission to counter efforts to undermine democratic institutions within the United States.” The motion was rejected by a vote of 207 – 218. [HR 1, Vote #54, 3/2/21; CQ, 3/2/21]

**Violence**

**January 2021: Miller-Meeks Compared Violence At The January 6th Insurrection To 2020 Racial Justice Protests, The Latter Of Which She Falsely Claimed Biden Had Not Condemned**

Quad-City Times: Miller-Meeks Claimed If Democrats Were Not Blamed For Violence During Protests Against Police Killings, “Trump And Republicans Likewise Should Not Be Held To Blame For The U.S. Capitol Riot.” “Miller-Meeks said that if Democrats were not blamed or held accountable for violence that erupted during protests this summer over police killings of unarmed Black men and women, Trump and Republicans likewise should not be held to blame for the U.S. Capitol riot and Americans expressing ‘grievances’ over what numerous state and federal courts and election officials have found was a free and fair election. ‘Just as over the summer when we saw social unrest and violence and destruction of public and private property, and encampments in various cities, the Democrats did not demand that this action stop,’ Miller-Meeks falsely claimed. Before he spoke out against violence in Portland at the end of August, Biden had condemned violent protests soon after the death of George Floyd.” [Quad-City Times, 1/7/21]

Cedar Rapids Gazette: Miller-Meeks’ Claims About A Lack Of Accountability For Summer Violence Tied To Racial Injustices Ignored “Widespread Condemnation, Including From Biden, Of The Street Violence.” “Although condemning the mob violence, Miller-Meeks echoed Trump's claims of 'fraud' in the election - without offering evidence - and said, 'There is plenty of blame to go around to all of us.' She suggested if Democrats weren’t blamed or held accountable for summer violence tied to racial injustices, Trump and Republicans shouldn't be blamed for the Capitol riot. Just as over the summer when we saw social unrest and violence and destruction of public and private property and encampments in various cities, the Democrats did not demand that this action stop,” Miller-Meeks said - ignoring widespread condemnation, including from Biden, of the street violence.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 1/8/21]

**Immediately Following The January 6th Insurrection, Miller-Meeks Had Said It Was “Incumbent” On Trump And Pence To “Decry And Denounce Any Violent Activities” On The Capitol Grounds**

**Immediately Following The January 6th Insurrection, Miller-Meeks Had Said It Was “Incumbent” On Trump And Pence To “Decry And Denounce Any Violent Activities” On The Capitol Grounds.** “Miller-Meeks said Wednesday evening she was encouraging people to disperse and to peacefully protest away from the Capitol. She said it was ‘incumbent’ on Trump and Vice President Mike Pence to do the same ’and to decry and denounce any violent activities that are going on on the Capitol grounds.’ While ’strongly in support of the Constitutional right to protest, protesting should be peaceful and should not be breaching buildings or storming the Capitol,’ Miller-Meeks told reporters. ’People are angry. They're frustrated. They're disappointed. All of that is understandable. ... People can be engaged. They can be passionate, but should not rise to the level of destroying property.’” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 1/6/21]

**2019: Miller-Meeks Said She Supported An Individual’s 2nd Amendment Rights “So That They Can Support Themselves Against A Government That Becomes Tyrannical”**

2019: Miller-Meeks Said She Supported An Individual’s 2nd Amendment Rights “So That They Can Support Themselves Against A Government That Becomes Tyrannical.” “I believe the 2nd Amendment to be an individual right and that citizens have the right to bear arms per our constitution so that they can support themselves against a government that becomes tyrannical.” [YouTube, Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 11/14/19] (VIDEO) 00:00:13
**Budget Issues**

**Significant Findings**

- Miller-Meeks voted against the Build Back Better Act (BBB), which would invest just under $2 trillion in reducing the cost of prescription drugs, health care, child care, housing and energy for American families.

- Miller-Meeks made multiple false or questionable criticisms of BBB:
  - Miller-Meeks falsely claimed BBB was “full of tax giveaways for the wealthy at the expense of hard-working American families.”
  - Independent fact-checkers found BBB would cut taxes for nearly 9 in 10 households, while its tax increases were aimed at large corporations and the wealthiest individuals.
  - Miller-Meeks falsely claimed BBB would cause inflation, but economists agreed the bill would not contribute to inflation and would in fact ease inflationary pressures.
  - Miller-Meeks cited the CBO in claiming BBB would increase the deficit, but the CBO score did not include expected revenue from increased IRS enforcement of tax laws.

- December 2021: Miller-Meeks repeatedly blocked efforts towards short-term continued government funding through February 2022.

- September 2021: Miller-Meeks voted against a bipartisan bill to avert a government shutdown.

- February 2021: Miller-Meeks voted against a continuing resolution to establish a budget, which would clear the way for coronavirus relief.

- Miller-Meeks repeatedly voted against measures to raise the debt limit even hours before the United States would have defaulted, which would have cost Americans millions of jobs.

- Miller-Meeks voted against millions of dollars of her own earmarks.
  - 2021: Miller-Meeks requested a total of $36,650,000 in earmarks.
  - Eight of Miller-Meeks’ community project funding requests totaling $32,900,000 were included in a group of appropriations bills she voted against.
  - Miller-Meeks voted against infrastructure funding she requested for her district days before writing an op-ed touting the “opportunity to invest in infrastructure we have long known was in need of repair.”

- 2020: Miller-Meeks called for a federal balanced budget amendment, which would lengthen and deepen the economic impacts of recessions and override commitments to programs like social security and veterans’ benefits.

*NOTE: Unlike appropriations bills, budget resolutions are not signed by the President and do not enact spending. Instead, the resolutions set targets for Congressional committees who will then write appropriations bills.*
Build Back Better Act

**Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Build Back Better Act**

**November 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Build Back Better Act.** On November 19, 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against the “Passage of the fiscal 2022 budget reconciliation bill, as amended, that would provide approximately $2 trillion in investments and tax cuts to address climate change and child care, health care, education, housing and other social policies intended to support families. It would establish a child care and early learning entitlement program, providing approximately $100 billion for the program through fiscal 2024. It would provide $18 billion through fiscal 2024 for a free universal preschool program. It would extend through 2022 the expanded child tax credit provided by prior coronavirus relief law (PL 117-2) and provide $5 billion to administer the credit. It would establish a paid family and medical leave benefit for up to four weeks per year, beginning in 2024. It would require the Health and Human Services Department to negotiate a "maximum fair price" for insulin and select Medicare-eligible, brand-name drugs that do not have generic competition. It would require manufacturers to provide rebates for single-source drugs under Medicare Parts B and D for which prices increase faster than inflation. For Medicare Part D, it would cap annual out-of-pocket limit at $2,000 beginning in 2024. It would establish or extend expanded eligibility for certain tax credits toward Affordable Care Act marketplace insurance premiums through 2025. It would establish or expand a number of tax credits to incentivize actions by businesses and individuals to mitigate climate change, including to expand credits for renewable energy production and facilities, carbon capture facilities, use of alternative fuels and energy efficiency improvements at residential properties; and to establish individual credits for the purchase of electric vehicles. It would raise royalty rates and fees for oil and gas drilling leases and cancel or ban certain offshore leases. It would provide $29 billion to support the deployment of low- and zero-emission technologies, more than $20 billion for federal climate resiliency and environmental conservation activities and $9 billion for federal procurement of electric vehicles and related infrastructure. It would provide $65 billion for public housing improvements, $24 billion for rental assistance housing vouchers and $15 billion for down payment assistance and loan programs for first-generation homebuyers. It would provide $9.8 billion for local transit projects to support mobility and affordable housing access disadvantaged communities and $9 billion for lead remediation and water line replacement projects. It would forgive all debt owed by the National Flood Insurance Program's debt, for a total of $20.5 billion. It would provide such sums as necessary for the USDA to forgive farm loan debt for economically distressed farmers and ranchers. It would provide $6.6 billion to the Small Business Administration and Minority Business Development Agency to help underrepresented individuals with business development. It would provide $20 billion for Labor and Education department workforce development programs and $1.9 billion for Labor Department worker protection agencies. It would allow individuals who entered the United States prior to Jan. 1, 2011, to receive a grant of parole allowing them to remain temporarily in the country for a period of five years, but no later than Sept. 30, 2021. It would temporarily increase from $10,000 to $80,000 the annual cap on the deduction for state and local taxes for tax years 2021 through 2030. To offset costs, it would establish or modify various taxes on corporations and high-income individuals, including to establish a 15 percent alternative minimum tax for corporations with an annual income exceeding $1 billion; a one percent tax on stock buybacks by public companies; and an additional five percent tax on individual income over $10 million and further three percent tax on income over $25 million. It would provide $78.9 billion to improve IRS operations and tax enforcement.” Passed by a vote of 220-213. [HR 5376, Vote 385, 11/19/21; CQ, 11/19/21]

- **Roosevelt Institute: Build Back Better Act Would Invest In Child Care, Creating Jobs And Allowing Parents To Get Back To Work.** “Convenient, affordable childcare is a major obstacle for working parents, illuminated even more so by school and daycare closures during the COVID-19 pandemic, which has disproportionately impacted women’s labor force participation. Increasing the capacity of industries in order to curb inflation of specific prices requires increasing the supply of labor. The Build Back Better Act invests in existing and new childcare facilities in underserved areas and provides subsidies to make childcare more affordable for qualifying households. Together, these investments would increase the supply of childcare, create new jobs, and allow parents to get back to work. [Roosevelt Institute, Fact Sheet, 9/28/21]
• Center For American Progress: Build Back Better Act Would Invest In Clean Electricity And Energy Efficiency, Reducing Energy Costs By $500 Per Year For The Average Household. “Build Back Better helps break the United States’ dependence on fossil fuels—an industry that’s particularly vulnerable to extreme weather, which has and will continue to be exacerbated by climate change—consumer energy costs will be reduced. Specifically, proposed investments in clean electricity and energy efficiency will make energy costs more affordable, saving the average household approximately $500 a year in reduced energy costs. This much-needed investment in clean energy would come at a time when energy prices have pushed up inflation for consecutive months.” [Center for American Progress, 11/16/21]
  
  • E&E News: The Budget Resolution Set “The Stage For Unprecedented Investments To Tackle Climate Change And Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions.” “Senate Democrats unveiled a $3.5 trillion budget resolution this morning, setting the stage for unprecedented investments to tackle climate change and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.” [E&E News, 8/9/21]

• The Build Back Better Deal Lowered Drug Prices For Seniors By Reducing Co-Pays And Establishing A $2,000 Out-Of-Pocket Limit in Medicare Part D. “Pelosi celebrated the drug-pricing agreement: ‘For a generation, House Democrats have been fighting to deliver real drug price negotiations that will lower costs. With today’s agreement on strong lower drug price provisions for the Build Back Better Act, Democrats have a path forward to make good on this transformational agenda for our seniors.’ She said the deal will lower drug prices for seniors, reduce their out-of-pocket co-pays and establish a $2,000 out-of-pocket limit for seniors’ expenses in Medicare Part D. The bill would also halt price hikes above inflation, which would affect all Americans, she said.” [NBC News, 11/2/21]

Miller-Meeks Made Multiple False Or Questionable Criticisms Of The Build Back Better Act

**Miller-Meeks Falsely Claimed BBB’s Tax Provisions Would Harm Middle Class Taxpayers And Working Families**


• FactCheck.Org: “In The First Year Of Biden’s Proposed Budget, 2022, Nearly Nine Out Of 10 Households Would See A Tax Cut.” “In the first year of Biden’s proposed budget, 2022, nearly nine out of 10 households would see a tax cut, according to the Tax Policy Center.” [FactCheck.org, 9/24/21]


• PolitiFact: Tax Increases In The Build Back Better Act Were “Aimed At People Making More Than $400,000” And “Large Corporations.” “While there could be some costs to middle and working class families, the tax increases in proposed reconciliation bills have been aimed at people making more than $400,000 large corporations [sic]. Those making could see a tax increase when tax rates enacted during the Trump Administration are to expire in 2025.” [PolitiFact, 11/8/21]
Miller-Meeks: Democrats’ Budget Resolution Was “Reckless And Unfair To The American Taxpayer.”
“Average Americans are already paying higher prices at the grocery store and gas pump. With the current inflation crisis, a $3.5 trillion spending spree that is hardly paid for is reckless and unfair to the American taxpayer. #IA02” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 8/24/21]

Miller-Meeks: Proposed Spending And Tax Increases Were “Extremely Troublesome Given That We’ve Seen The Economy Slow Down.” HOST: “I want to begin with something that Rich Edson touched on, how there is some significant disagreement between the parties over how this is going to get paid for. Republicans wanting to use unused COVID money, but then Democrats making it very clear that they want, as Senator Bernie Sanders has said, progressive taxation. How confident are you that any sort of bipartisan agreement can be met here?” MILLER-MEEKS: “Well, certainly you have senators working on a bipartisan agreement, and right now, their solution is a $1 trillion package without the tax increases, but then also in the background is floating another $6 trillion in spending which would have tax increases with it. And reports are the largest tax increase since 1968. So that's extremely troublesome given that we've seen the economy slow down. The economy was primed to take off as people got vaccinated. So, it's very worrisome and I think you indicated earlier, the Monmouth poll, it's showing that the majority of people are concerned about inflation, and they’re feeling it every single day.” [YouTube, Fox News, 6/19/21] (VIDEO) 00:00:13

Miller-Meeks Falsely Claimed BBB Would Cause Inflation, But The Bill Was Set To Ease Inflationary Pressures

Miller-Meeks Was Concerned That Democrats’ Budget Would Put The Country In Economic Jeopardy And Create Inflation. “Miller-Meeks is prepared to vote for the infrastructure plan, but — as for the larger spending bill — she is concerned that it would put the country in economic jeopardy. ‘When you’re chasing too much, you have inflation. We’ve already seen inflation … People aren’t feeling the effect of having an increase in their salary, because it’s costing them more to buy food,’ Miller-Meeks said.” [Daily Iowan, 10/17/21]

Economists At Leading Rating Agencies Said The Build Back Better Agenda Would Not Add To Inflationary Pressures. “U.S. President Joe Biden's infrastructure and social spending legislation will not add to inflationary pressures in the U.S. economy, economists and analysts in leading rating agencies told Reuters on Tuesday.” [Reuters, 11/16/21]

17 Nobel Laureate Economists Signed A Letter Saying That Biden’s Economic Agenda Would Ease Inflationary Pressures. “Biden promised Friday the bills would lower costs. In the long-term, many economists agree. For example, 17 Nobel laureates in economics signed a letter saying Biden’s policies would ‘ease longer-term inflationary pressures.’ Many of Biden’s investments — roads and transit, building more affordable homes, lower drug costs and reducing child care costs — should result in a more productive economy and lower prices.” [Washington Post, 11/7/21]

Miller-Meeks Cited Incomplete CBO Score In Claiming BBB Would Increase The Deficit

Miller-Meeks Cited CBO Score In Claiming Build Back Better Act Was “Not Fully Paid For, Doesn’t Cost Zero, And Will Increase The Deficit.” “The CBO estimated the 10-year cost of the bill to be $1.68 trillion. Biden and Democrats had touted the bill as costing $1.85 trillion. ‘The CBO has now said what we have known for months: this package is not fully paid for, doesn’t cost zero, and will increase the deficit,’ Miller-Meeks said in a statement. ‘We must go back to responsible spending and bipartisan solutions to build a brighter future for the next generation.’” [Des Moines Register, 11/19/21]

• Miller-Meeks: “CBO Says Even With Tax Increases [Build Back Better Act] Will Still Cost ~ $400 B.” “@RepMMM Past the 4:30 am mark and @GOPLeader McCarthy still going strong. The country is too important so he is preventing Dems from voting on behemoth of bill that CBO says even with tax increases will still cost ~ $400 B. About to break Pelosi’s record. We’re with you Kevin!” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 11/19/21]
Des Moines Register: CBO Score Miller-Meeks Cited “Does Not Account For Revenue The Government Could Receive As A Result Of Stronger IRS Enforcement Of Tax Laws.” “Republicans blasted the legislation, saying it would add to the nation's deficit. An estimate from the Congressional Budget Office found the bill would increase the deficit by about $367 billion over the next decade. But that estimate does not account for revenue the government could receive as a result of stronger IRS enforcement of tax laws. The Biden administration believes stricter enforcement will bring in about $400 billion in additional revenue over a decade, while the CBO estimates it would raise about $207 billion.” [Des Moines Register, 11/19/21]

Miller-Meeks Repeatedly Criticized The Procedural Handling Of The 2021 Budget Reconciliation

Miller-Meeks Said The Build Back Better Act “Had No Republican Input, Even Though Congress Is Evenly Divided.” “I will not support a bill that is directly tied to a multi-trillion dollar reckless tax-and-spend package that increases inflation and had no Republican input, even though Congress is evenly divided,’ she said. ‘We could have passed a clean infrastructure package already on a bipartisan basis like the Senate did and found reasonable ways to pay for it,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘Instead, the majority decided to play politics and hold good ideas hostage to push through their agenda in a partisan manner,’ she said.” [Quad-City Times, 11/6/21]


HOST: “I do want to hit on this $6 trillion spending package the Democrats are floating, because really, they want to go big right now while they feel they can, and Chuck Schumer saying that, you know, they'll use reconciliation if necessary. It's their one last shot this year. But how much will that go toward any goodwill that's being built, that's been built by this bipartisan group of senators this week?” MILLER-MEEKS: “You know, I think that really undermines bipartisanship. You know, the country has an appetite for bipartisanship where it makes common sense and where it's practical. But you know, when you think of what happened during the election, and their very slim majority in the House, and, you know, a tie in the Senate, which is of course broken by the Vice President, they don't have a huge mandate, but yet, their policies are if they have a huge mandate, and then using, you know, both reconciliation and the threat of ending the filibuster in order to get things passed, I think, is really going to come back to haunt them. But it does undermine bipartisanship and the desire to work together, especially on infrastructure.” [YouTube, Fox News, 6/19/21] (VIDEO) 00:03:24

Government Funding AndShutdowns

December 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted To Block Efforts To Fund The Government Through February 2022

December 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Short-Term Continued Government Funding Through February 18, 2022. On December 2, 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against the “Passage of the the [sic] fiscal 2022 further continuing resolution that would provide funding for federal government operations and services through Feb. 18, 2022, at fiscal 2021 levels and provide $7 billion in emergency funding for Afghan evacuee assistance, as well as $1.6 billion for the Health and Human Services Department to provide shelter and services to unaccompanied minors who have crossed the U.S. border. Within funding to support Afghan evacuees, it would provide $4.3 billion for Defense Department assistance to refugees on U.S. military installations; $1.3 billion for Health and Human Services Department resettlement and support services for Afghan arrivals and refugees; and $1.3 billion for the State Department, including $1.2 billion for resettlement and support services for Afghans in the United States and $80.3 million for related diplomatic activities and additional evacuations. It would require the Office of Management and Budget to submit a report on the strategy and transition plan for concluding Afghan resettlement initiatives. It would extend for the duration of the continuing resolution a number of expiring programs and authorities previously extended by a prior continuing resolution (PL 117-43 / HR 4350), including the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program and the National Flood Insurance Program; HHS authority to appoint personnel to National Disaster Medical System positions to respond to public health emergencies; the emergency classification of fentanyl-related substances as schedule I controlled substances; and the increased
federal medical assistance percentage for U.S. territories, offset by a reduction of $13 million for the Medicare Improvement Fund. Among other provisions, it would extend through December 31, 2021, a waiver making supportive living facility residents eligible for Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program benefits and increase from $100 million to $200 million annual funding the president may direct for immediate foreign military assistance to respond to an unforeseen emergency.” The bill passed by a vote of 221-212. [H.R. 6119, Vote 399, 12/2/21; CQ, 12/2/21]

- Iowa Capital Dispatch: Miller-Meeks Voted Against A “Short-Term Budget Bill That Keeps The Country Funded Until February.” “Congress averted a government shutdown on Thursday by passing a short-term budget bill that keeps the country funded until February. Iowa’s Republican members voted against the budget bill. Lone Democrat Cindy Axne voted in favor.” [Iowa Capital Dispatch, 12/3/21]

September 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against A Bipartisan Bill To Avert A Government Shutdown And Provide $28.6 Billion In Aid For Regions Struck By Extreme Weather. “Congress made a last-minute dash to avert a government shutdown on Thursday, with the U.S. Senate and House approving a short-term spending bill just hours ahead of a midnight deadline. In the Senate, every Democratic and independent senator and 15 Republicans supported the bill in the 65-35 vote. The GOP senators in the ‘aye’ tally included Bill Cassidy and John Kennedy of Louisiana; Susan Collins of Maine; Roy Blunt of Missouri; and Richard Burr and Thom Tillis of North Carolina. Iowa’s Chuck Grassley and Joni Ernst voted against the bill. The House later passed the federal spending bill — which will keep government agencies funded at current levels through December 3, and provide $28.6 billion in aid for regions struck by extreme weather — on a vote of 254-175. Every House Democrat and 34 House Republicans voted to send the measure to President Joe Biden, who is expected to sign it. Iowa Republicans Randy Feenstra, Ashley Hinson and Mariannette Miller-Meeks opposed the bill, while Democrat Cindy Axne supported it.” [Iowa Capital Dispatch, 9/30/21]

September 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Extending Government Funding Through December 3, 2021. On September 30, 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against the “DeLauro, D-Conn., motion to concur in the Senate amendment to the bill that would provide funding for federal government operations and services through December 3, 2021, at fiscal 2021 levels and provide emergency funding for natural disaster relief and Afghan evacuee assistance.” The motion was agreed to by a vote of 254-175. [CQ, 9/30/21; HR 5305, Vote #311, 9/30/21]

- Short-Term Government Funding Extension Included $28.6 Billion For Natural Disaster Relief. “It would provide $28.6 billion in supplemental appropriations for natural disaster relief, including $10 billion for the Agriculture Department to cover agricultural losses; $5.7 billion for Army Corps of Engineers flood and storm damage response; $5 billion for disaster-related community development block grants; $2.6 billion to reimburse states and territories for damage to roads and bridges; $1.36 billion for the Forest Service and $636 million for the Interior Department, including for wildfire response; $1.2 billion for Small Business Administration disaster loans; $895 million for Navy and Air Force facility repairs; $345 million for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, including $200 million for fishery disaster response; and $22 million for the National Institute of Standards and Technology to investigate building collapses.” [CQ, 9/30/21]

- Short-Term Government Funding Extension Included $6.3 Billion For Afghan Refugees. “It would provide $6.3 billion in supplemental appropriations to support Afghan evacuees, including $2.2 billion for Defense Department assistance to Afghans under the special immigrant visa program and on U.S. military installations; $1.7 billion for Health and Human Services Department resettlement and support services for Afghan arrivals and refugees; and $1.8 billion for the State Department, including $277 million for evacuation and related services, $1.1 billion for resettlement and support services for Afghans in the United States, and $415 million for migration and refugee assistance. The bill would also provide additional appropriations or higher spending rates for certain programs, including $2.5 billion for Health and Human Services Department refugee assistance to support services for unaccompanied minors who have crossed the U.S. border; $250
February 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Establishing The Congressional Budget For The United States Government For Fiscal Year 2021 And The Appropriate Budgetary Levels For Fiscal Years 2022 Through 2030. In February 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against: “Agreeing to the concurrent resolution, as amended, that would set annual budgetary levels for federal revenues, new budget authority, outlays, deficits and public debt for fiscal years 2021 through 2030, including to outline annual levels of new budget authority and outlays for each of the 20 major budget function categories. The concurrent resolution would direct 12 House committees to make recommendations within their respective jurisdictions for budget reconciliation legislation that combined could increase the deficit by up to $1.9 trillion through fiscal 2030, intended to be used as a vehicle for further COVID-19 relief. It would require the committees to report their recommendations to the House Budget Committee by Feb. 16, 2021, and specify amounts by which each committee's recommendations could increase the total deficit, including $940.72 billion for the Ways and Means Committee, $357.08 billion for the Education and Labor Committee, $350.7 billion for the Oversight and Reform Committee and $188.5 billion for the Energy and Commerce Committee. The concurrent resolution would include two reserve funds for the House Budget Committee to revise committee allocations and other budgetary levels for budget reconciliation legislation within the deficit limits established by the concurrent resolution, and for any other legislation that would not increase the deficit for a five-year time period through fiscal 2025 or a ten-year time period through fiscal 2030. Among other provisions, it would authorize the House and Senate Appropriations committees to receive a separate discretionary budget allocation for administrative expenses related to the Social Security Administration and the United States Postal Service. and it would continue for fiscal 2021 certain existing limitations on advance appropriations.” The resolution passed 218 to 212. [H Con Res 11, Vote #21, 2/3/21; CQ, 2/3/21]

Quad-City Times: The February 2021 Continuing Resolution “Could Clear The Way For President Joe Biden’s $1.9 Trillion Coronavirus Relief Package.” “Iowa Republican U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks on Friday voted against a budget resolution that could clear the way for President Joe Biden’s $1.9 trillion coronavirus relief package. The House passed the Senate-amended budget plan by a vote 219-209, after senators agreed to an amendment by U.S. Sen. Joni Ernst, R-Iowa, to prevent a $15 federal minimum wage hike during a global pandemic. Ernst, in a statement, said such move would kill jobs for lower-wage workers and severely burden Iowa small businesses and rural economies that are facing unprecedented challenges amidst the COVID-19 pandemic. Miller-Meeks echoed Ernst in her own statement Friday on voting against the budget resolution. ‘I am disappointed that Congressional leaders brought a partisan budget resolution to the floor costing $1.9 trillion of taxpayer dollars,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘Congress has acted in a bipartisan manner to address the pandemic, and it is unfortunate that we are choosing to use the reconciliation process instead of having an open debate on a relief package that could have an immediate impact on the lives of our constituents.’ Instead, Miller-Meeks argued Democrats pushed forward ‘partisan issues such as a national $15/hour minimum wage, which would kill thousands of jobs across the country and in southeastern Iowa, and bailouts for state governments, such as Illinois, who have mismanaged their budgets.”’ [Quad-City Times, 2/5/21]

Miller-Meeks Claimed Democrats Had Pushed “Partisan Issues Such As […] Bailouts For State Governments, Such As Illinois, Who Have Mismanaged Their Budgets.” “Iowa Republican U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks on Friday voted against a budget resolution that could clear the way for President Joe Biden's $1.9 trillion coronavirus relief package. The House passed the Senate-amended budget plan by a vote 219-209, after senators agreed to an amendment by U.S. Sen. Joni Ernst, R-Iowa, to prevent a $15 federal minimum wage hike during a global pandemic. Ernst, in a statement, said such move would kill jobs for lower-wage workers and severely burden Iowa small businesses and rural economies that are facing unprecedented challenges amidst the COVID-19 pandemic. Miller-Meeks echoed Ernst in her own statement Friday on voting against the budget resolution passed 218 to 212. [H Con Res 11, Vote #21, 2/3/21; CQ, 2/3/21]
‘I am disappointed that Congressional leaders brought a partisan budget resolution to the floor costing $1.9 trillion of taxpayer dollars,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘Congress has acted in a bipartisan manner to address the pandemic, and it is unfortunate that we are choosing to use the reconciliation process instead of having an open debate on a relief package that could have an immediate impact on the lives of our constituents.’ Instead, Miller-Meeks argued Democrats pushed forward ‘partisan issues such as a national $15/hour minimum wage, which would kill thousands of jobs across the country and in southeastern Iowa, and bailouts for state governments, such as Illinois, who have mismanaged their budgets.’” [Quad-City Times, 2/5/21]

### Debt Limit

**Miller-Meeks Repeatedly Voted Against Measures To Raise The Debt Limit Even Hours Before The United States Would Have Defaulted, Which Would Have Cost Americans Millions Of Jobs**

#### December 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Considering Raising The Debt Limit.
On December 14, 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against the “Adoption of the rule (H Res 852) that would provide for House floor consideration of the resolution to increase the debt limit (S J Res 33). The rule would provide for up to one hour of debate on the bill.” The rule was adopted by a vote of 220-212. [H. Res. 852, Vote 446, 12/14/21; CQ, 12/14/21]

#### December 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Raising The Debt Limit By $2.5 Trillion.
On December 14, 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against the “Passage of the resolution that would increase the statutory limit on federal debt by $2.5 trillion.” The bill passed by a vote of 221-209. [S. J. Res. 33, Vote 449, 12/15/21; CQ, 12/15/21]

- **HEADLINE:** “House Passes Debt Ceiling Increase, Sending It To Biden To Avoid Default Hours Before Deadline.” [CNBC, 12/15/21]

- **Congress Passed A Debt Limit Increase Early The Day The Debt Limit Would Have Been Reached.** “Congress early Wednesday voted to raise the nation's debt limit by $2.5 trillion, officially staving off default and the economic peril that would come if the U.S. were unable to pay its bills. […] Lawmakers managed to get the measure passed just in time to avoid an economic scare. Treasury Secretary Janet Yellen told lawmakers she estimated the United States would reach its debt ceiling by Wednesday. If lawmakers didn't address the debt limit by then, the U.S. would have defaulted on its debts for the first time, which could lead to a global recession, Treasury Department officials and experts said.” [USA Today, 12/15/21]

#### October 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against A Resolution To Concur In A Senate Amendment Of The Debt Limit Suspension Bill.
On October 12, 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against the “Adoption of the resolution (H Res 716) that would provide for floor consideration of the Family Violence Prevention and Services Improvement Act (HR 2119), the Providing Urgent Maternal Protections for Nursing Mothers (PUMP) for Nursing Mothers Act (HR 3110) and the Protect Older Job Applicants (POJA) Act (HR 3992). It would provide for floor consideration of eight amendments to HR 2119; two amendments to HR 3110; and two amendments to HR 3992, as well as up to one hour of general debate on each bill. It would also provide for automatic agreement to a motion to concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the debt limit suspension bill (S 1301).” [CQ, 10/12/21; H. Res. 716, Vote 315, 10/12/21]

In September 2021 Miller-Meeks voted against: “Passage of the bill, as amended by a House substitute, that would suspend the statutory limit on federal debt through December 16, 2022.” The bill passed by a vote of 219-212. [S. 1301, Vote #310, 9/29/21; CQ, 9/29/21]

On September 21, 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against the “Passage of the bill that would provide funding for federal government operations and services through December 3, 2021, at fiscal 2021 levels; provide emergency funding for natural disaster relief and Afghan evacuee assistance; and suspend the statutory limit on federal debt through
Moody’s Analytics: If Congress Failed To Raise The Debt Limit, The U.S. Economy Would Lose 6 Million Jobs And $15 Trillion In Household Wealth And The Unemployment Rate Would Surge To 9 Percent. “The United States could plunge into an immediate recession if Congress fails to raise the debt ceiling and the country defaults on its payment obligations this fall, according to one analysis released Tuesday. Mark Zandi, chief economist at Moody’s Analytics, found that a prolonged impasse over the debt ceiling would cost the U.S. economy up to 6 million jobs, wipe out as much as $15 trillion in household wealth, and send the unemployment rate surging to roughly 9 percent from around 5 percent.” [Washington Post, 9/21/21]

Moody’s Analytics: “This Economic Scenario Is Cataclysmic. … The Downturn Would Be Comparable To That Suffered During The Financial Crisis” Of 2008. “…This economic scenario is cataclysmic. … The downturn would be comparable to that suffered during the financial crisis’ of 2008, said the report, written by Zandi and Bernard Yaros, assistant director and economist at Moody’s Analytics.” [Washington Post, 9/21/21]

Washington Post: Failing To Raise The Debt Limit Threatened $20 Billion In Social Security Payments For Seniors. “If Congress fails to increase the debt limit, Treasury would be unable to pay debts as they come due. Treasury Secretary Janet L. Yellen said earlier this week that such a default would be unprecedented in U.S. history. Moody’s ‘best estimate’ is that this date is Oct. 20, although Treasury has not given a more precise day. At that point, Treasury officials would face excruciating choices, such as whether to fail to pay $20 billion owed to seniors on Social Security, or to fail to pay bondholders of U.S. debt — a decision that could undermine faith in U.S. credit and permanently drive federal borrowing costs higher.” [Washington Post, 9/21/21]

Washington Post: Failing To Raise The Debt Limit Would Raise Consumer Costs And Interest Rates And Lead To A Long-Term Decline In The U.S. Dollar. “Failure to raise the debt limit would have catastrophic impacts on global financial markets. Interest rates would spike as investors demand a higher rate of return for the risk of taking on U.S. debt given uncertainty about repayment. An increase in interest rates would ripple through the economy, raising costs not only for taxpayers but also for consumers and other borrowers. The value of the U.S. dollar would also decline long term as investors questioned the security of purchasing U.S. treasuries. The cost of auto and home loans would rise.” [Washington Post, 9/21/21]

Miller-Meeks Joined A Letter Opposing Any Effort To Raise The Debt Ceiling. “U.S. Reps. Randy Feenstra, R-Iowa, and Mariannette Miller-Meeks, R-Iowa, joined over 100 of their colleagues in signing an open letter to the American people, opposing any effort by congressional Democrats to raise the debt ceiling. Last month, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimated Congress will need to raise the debt limit by October or November. Negotiations to raise the debt ceiling have historically been bipartisan, but as the letter states, Democrats control Congress and the White House, and have used this as an opportunity to pass trillions of dollars in unprecedented spending.” [Iowa Torch, 9/2/21]

**Miller-Meeks Voted Against Her Own Earmarks**

2021: Miller-Meeks Requested A Total Of $36,650,000 In Earmarks

2021: Miller-Meeks Requested A Total Of $36,650,000 In Earmarks For Her District. [Miller-Meeks Community Project Funding website, accessed 12/21/21]

August 2021: Miller-Meeks Requested $14.5 Million In Earmarks. “In the 2nd District, Republican Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks has requested $14.15 million, including $600,000 for a bridge replacement in Scott County, $5 million for an Indian Hills Community College career counseling program and $750,000 to complete the design phase for a new Iowa City transit operations and maintenance facility. The current 40-year-old facility is over capacity and unable to support more growth, Miller-Meeks said in her request. The roof
leaks, the bay doors malfunction and crumbling concrete and deteriorating brickwork present maintenance challenges, according to Darian Nagle-Gamm, Iowa City transportation services director.” [Daily Nonpareil, 8/13/21]

- **August 2021: Miller-Meeks Requested $5 Million For A Career Counseling Program At Indian Hills Community College.** “After a 10-year ban on congressional earmarks, Iowa’s U.S. House members are seeking more than $51 million for projects ranging from expanding child care centers to replacing a fire station in rural north Iowa to modernizing Mississippi River locks and dams. […] In the 2nd District, Republican Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks has requested $14.15 million, including $600,000 for a bridge replacement in Scott County, $5 million for an Indian Hills Community College career counseling program and $750,000 to complete the design phase for a new Iowa City transit operations and maintenance facility.” [Daily Nonpareil, 8/13/21]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eight Of Miller-Meeks’ Community Project Funding Requests Totaling $32,900,000 Were Included In A Group Of Appropriations Bills She Voted Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


**Miller-Meeks Voted Against H.R. 4502.** [H.R. 4502, Vote 247, 7/29/21]

**$2 Million Was Approved For Miller-Meeks’ Community Project Funding Request For Indian Hills Community College In The LHHS Subcommittee Appropriations Bill**

Miller-Meeks Requested $5 Million In Community Project Funding For Indian Hills Community College. “Proposed recipient: Indian Hills Community College Recipient address: 525 Grandview Avenue, Ottumwa IA 52501 Requested amount: $5,000,000” [Office Of Rep. Miller-Meeks, Accessed 7/30/21]

- **$2 Million In Community Project Funding Was Approved For Indian Hills Community College In The Labor, Health And Human Services, Education, And Related Agencies Subcommittee Appropriations Bill.** [House Appropriations Committee, Accessed 7/30/21]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miller-Meeks’ Two Approved Interior And Environment Requests Totaled $4.2 Million</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Miller-Meeks Requested $1.7 Million In Community Project Funding For The City Of Burlington’s Sewer Separation Project.** “Proposed recipient: City of Burlington Recipient address: 400 Washington Street, Burlington, IA 52601 Requested amount: $1,700,000 Explanation of request: The requested funds will allow the City of Burlington to complete additional sewer separation and road work.” [Office Of Rep. Miller-Meeks, Accessed 7/30/21]

- **$1.7 Million In Community Project Funding Was Approved For The City Of Burlington’s Sewer Separation Project In The Interior, Environment, And Related Agencies Subcommittee Appropriations Bill.** [House Appropriations Committee, Accessed 7/30/21]

**Miller-Meeks Requested $2.5 Million In Community Project Funding For The City Of Ottumwa’s Blake’s Branch Sewer Project.** “Proposed recipient: City of Ottumwa Recipient address: 105 East Third Street, Ottumwa, IA 52501 Requested amount: $2,500,000 Explanation of request: The Blake’s Branch Sewer project is a piece of
the City of Ottumwa’s continued efforts to meet federal and state mandates to remedy the Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) throughout the City.” [Office Of Rep. Miller-Meeks, Accessed 7/30/21]

- $2.5 Million In Community Project Funding Was Approved For The City Of Ottumwa’s Blake’s Branch Sewer Project In The Interior, Environment, And Related Agencies Subcommittee Appropriations Bill. [House Appropriations Committee, Accessed 7/30/21]

Miller-Meeks’ Four Approved Transportation And Housing And Urban Development Requests Totaled $4.2 Million

Miller-Meeks Requested $1 Million For The Reconstruction Of Iowa Highway 38 In Tipton. “Proposed recipient: City of Tipton Recipient address: City Hall, 407 Lynn Street, Tipton, IA 52772 Requested amount: $1,000,000 Explanation of request: The project request is for the first two of three phases of the reconstruction of Iowa Highway 38, which is also known as Cedar Street. This is Tipton's ‘Main Street.’” [Office Of Rep. Miller-Meeks, Accessed 7/30/21]

- $2 Million In Community Project Funding Was Approved For The Reconstruction Of Iowa Highway 38 In Tipton In The Transportation, Housing And Urban Development, And Related Agencies Subcommittee Appropriations Bill. [House Appropriations Committee, Accessed 7/30/21]

Miller-Meeks Requested $850,000 For The Mahaska/Oskaloosa Driving Economic Success (MODES) Planning Study. “Proposed recipient: Mahaska County Recipient address: 2074 Old Highway 163 Oskaloosa, Iowa 52577 Requested amount: $850,000 Explanation of request: The City of Oskaloosa, with the support of Mahaska County, seek Community Project Funding from Congress to help fund the public-private project, dubbed Mahaska/Oskaloosa Driving Economic Success (MODES) Planning and Environment Linkages (PEL) study and a streamlined Environmental Assessment (EA) for a new roadway that will provide improved regional and local access in rural east central Iowa.” [Office Of Rep. Miller-Meeks, Accessed 7/30/21]

- $850,000 In Community Project Funding Was Approved For The MODES Planning Study In The Transportation, Housing And Urban Development, And Related Agencies Subcommittee Appropriations Bill. [House Appropriations Committee, Accessed 7/30/21]

Miller-Meeks Requested $600,000 For The Scott County Bridge Replacement Project. “Proposed recipient: Scott County Secondary Roads Department Recipient address: 950 E. Blackhawk Trail, Eldridge, Iowa 52748 Requested amount: $600,000 Explanation of request: The Scott County Secondary Roads Department seeks Community Project Funding from Congress for a bridge replacement project located at 250 feet northeast of 18378 Wells Ferry Road, Pleasant Valley, IA 52767. This bridge is on the National Bridge Inspection system and considered structurally deficient.” [Office Of Rep. Miller-Meeks, Accessed 7/30/21]

- $600,000 In Community Project Funding Was Approved For The Scott County Bridge Replacement Project In The Transportation, Housing And Urban Development, And Related Agencies Subcommittee Appropriations Bill. [House Appropriations Committee, Accessed 7/30/21]

Miller-Meeks Requested $750,000 For The Iowa City Transit Operations And Maintenance Facility. “Proposed recipient: Iowa City Transit/City of Iowa City Recipient address: 410 E Washington Street, Iowa City, IA 52240 Requested amount: $750,000 Explanation of request: Community Project Funding is requested for completing the design phase for the new Iowa City Transit Operations and Maintenance Facility (‘Transit Facility’).” [Office Of Rep. Miller-Meeks, Accessed 7/30/21]

- $750,000 In Community Project Funding Was Approved For The Iowa City Transit Operations And Maintenance Facility In The Transportation, Housing And Urban Development, And Related Agencies Subcommittee Appropriations Bill. [House Appropriations Committee, Accessed 7/30/21]
Miller-Meeks’ Approved Energy And Water Development Request Was For $22.5 Million

Miller-Meeks Requested $22.5 Million For The Upper Mississippi River –Navigation And Ecosystem Sustainability Program. “Proposed recipient: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Rock Island District Recipient address: 1500 Rock Island Dr, Rock Island, IL 61201 Requested amount: $22,500,000 Explanation of request: NESP has widespread bipartisan support from the five states on the UMRS and the support of industry, America’s building trades, and environmental groups. Therefore, we are requesting full funding of NESP’s construction for FY 22. NESP has a total FY 22 construction-ready capability of $22.5 million.” [Office Of Rep. Miller-Meeks, Accessed 7/30/21]

The Upper Mississippi River NESP Funding Was Included In The Energy And Water Development Subcommittee Appropriations Bill. “It is those last two connections the pair celebrated last week with news that their bipartisan request for $22.5 million for lock and dam — as well as environmental — renovations on the Mississippi River had passed the Appropriations Committee as part of the 2021 funding bill for Energy and Water Development. The project would breathe life into the Upper Mississippi River Navigation and Ecosystem Sustainability Program, which had sat stagnant for years. […] ‘This is absolutely a crucial issue for our river economies,’ said Hinson during her weekly call with Iowa press on Friday. ‘This is about safety, expediency, efficiency and making sure we have viable ways to get our products to market. The entire country is dependent upon the river economy of the Mississippi River. It’s a huge win for the Midwest, specifically Iowa’s farmers and ag producers.’” [Telegraph Herald, 7/18/21]

Jan. 2021: Miller-Meeks Tweeted About “The Importance Of Passing A Much Needed Infrastructure Bill To Rebuild/Enhance Our Infrastructure On The Mississippi River.” “An informative tour of Lock 14 in Pleasant Valley alongside @MikeNaigIA this Friday afternoon. It showcases the importance of passing a much needed infrastructure bill to rebuild/enhance our infrastructure on the Mississippi River. Thank you for having us! #ia02” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 1/29/21]

Miller-Meeks Voted Against Infrastructure Funding She Requested For Her District Days Before Writing An Op-Ed Touting The “Opportunity To Invest In Infrastructure We Have Long Known Was In Need Of Repair”

HEADLINE: “Miller-Meeks Votes Against Infrastructure Bill With Earmarks For Iowa's 2nd District.” [Quad-City Times, 7/2/21]

Miller-Meeks Voted Against An Infrastructure Deal That Included More Than $15 Million For Projects In Her District. “Iowa freshman U.S Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks on Thursday joined fellow House Republicans in voting against a $759 billion infrastructure bill, despite the measure including more than $15 million for trail and road projects in Iowa’s 2nd congressional district.” [Quad-City Times, 7/2/21]

Miller-Meeks Op-Ed: Getting The Nation Back To Work After COVID-19 Was “Also An Opportunity To Invest In Infrastructure We Have Long Known Was In Need Of Repair.” “Iowans have reason to be optimistic. The state and the country are getting back to business, but the reality is the COVID-19 pandemic scarred our economy. Although Iowa businesses are challenged by a lack of workers, nationwide too many people continue to struggle with unemployment. In order to get our economy running at full capacity, it is important we get the nation back to work. It’s also an opportunity to invest in infrastructure we have long known was in need of repair.” [Ottumwa Courier, Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 7/6/21]

Balanced Budget Amendment

2020: Miller-Meeks Called For A Federal Balanced Budget Amendment

2020: Miller-Meeks Said “I Think There Should Be A Balanced Budget Amendment At The Federal Level.”
“Miller-Meeks fielded questions from business representatives on a variety of topics. (Hart will have a similar session at 10 a.m. Oct. 22). The sessions were arranged by the Partnership, Young Professionals Connection and the Greater Des Moines Leadership Institute. [...] ‘I do not agree with closing the economy to handle the pandemic. I think we need to learn from this. When it comes to handling the federal debt, you can either decrease spending, or you can increase revenue. I do think we need to look at our spending levels and where we spend money. Do we have a return on investment? Do the programs we have in place do what they were intended to do? Do they have an outcome? Do we heaven [sic] have an outcome measure? … We have a balanced budget amendment in the state of Iowa and I think there should be a balanced budget amendment at the federal level.’” [Iowa Capital Dispatch, 9/10/20]

2010: Miller-Meeks Said She Supported Enacting A Balanced Budget Amendment And Enacting Presidential Line-Item Veto. According to Miller-Meeks for Congress 2010 website under “Cut Spending, Cut Government Waste”, Miller-Meeks stated “while both Republicans and Democrats are responsible for years of past budget deficits, together, we must be the solution for future generations who will inherit this massive legacy of debt. We need to enact a balanced budget amendment, afford the President line-item veto authority, cut spending and root out well known and documented waste in entitlement programs like Medicare and Medicaid which add up to tens of billions of dollars every single year.” [Miller-Meeks for Congress 2010, accessed 6/15/20]

A Balanced Budget Amendment Would Lengthen And Deepen The Economic Impacts Of Recessions And Override Commitments To Programs Like Social Security And Veterans’ Benefits

CBPP: A Federal Balanced Budget Amendment Would “Threaten Significant Economic Harm” And Lengthen and Deepen The Economic Impacts Of Recessions. “A balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution would be an unusual and economically dangerous way to address the nation’s long-term fiscal problems. It would threaten significant economic harm, as explained below. It also would raise a host of problems for the operation of Social Security and other vital federal programs. It’s striking that the House Republican leadership intends to schedule a vote on a balanced budget amendment just a few months after the President and Congress enacted a tax cut that will increase deficits by as much as $2 trillion over the next decade.[1] The economic problems with such an amendment are the most serious. By requiring a balanced budget every year, no matter the state of the economy, such an amendment would raise serious risks of tipping weak economies into recession and making recessions longer and deeper, causing very large job losses. The amendment would force policymakers to cut federal programs, raise taxes, or both when the economy is weak or already in recession — the exact opposite of what good economic policy would advise. That’s because the amendment would force policymakers to cut federal programs, raise taxes, or both when the economy is weak or already in recession — the exact opposite of what good economic policy would advise.” [Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, 3/16/18]

- Center for American Progress: The Balanced-Budget Amendment Threatens Americans’ Health Care, Social Security, and Jobs [Center for American Progress, 4/11/18]

- AARP Opposed The Balanced Budget Amendment Because It Would “Likely Harm Social Security And Medicare, Subjecting Both Programs To Potentially Deep Cuts.” “AARP is writing to express our opposition to a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States. [...] A balanced budget amendment would likely harm Social Security and Medicare, subjecting both programs to potentially deep cuts without regard to the impact on the health and financial security of individuals. It would also likely diminish the resources available for programs assisting Americans who are least able to provide for themselves – services such as meals or heating for those who are too poor or physically unable to take care of their basic needs without some support.” [AARP, Letter, 4/9/18]

- A Balanced Budget Amendment Would Override All Government Guarantees And Promises Written Into Law – Including Social Security, Medicare, Veterans Benefits, And Military Pensions. “In general, a balanced budget requirement in the U.S. Constitution would override any and all government guarantees and promises written into law: the guarantee to pay interest on the debt; or to pay insurance and guarantee claims
for bank deposits, floods, loan defaults, and nuclear accidents; or to pay program benefits for Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, unemployment benefits, veterans’ benefits, or military and civil service pensions; or to pay contractors who have delivered goods or services to the federal government.” [CBPP, 3/16/18]

• **Under A Balanced Budget Amendment, It Would Be Unconstitutional For Social Security To Use Its Savings – What Workers Already Paid In – To Pay Promised Benefits; Benefits Could Have To Be Cut.** “Currently, Social Security holds $2.9 trillion in Treasury securities. But under the balanced budget amendment, it would essentially be unconstitutional for Social Security to draw down these savings to pay promised benefits. Instead, benefits could have to be cut, because all federal expenditures would have to be covered by tax revenues collected during that same year.” [CBPP, 3/16/18]

---

### Budgetary Effect On Inflation


**Miller-Meeks: Build Back Better “Won't Do Much To Help Slow Down Inflation.”** “Higher prices at the pump, in the store, and pretty much everywhere. The Administration's reckless and excessive spending led us to this point. #BuildBackBroke won't do much to help slow down inflation.” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 12/10/21]

**Miller-Meeks Op-Ed: “Americans’ Pocketbooks Are Hurting Due To The Failed Policies And Excessive Spending Of This Administration.”** “Recently, the Biden Administration has proven once again how out of touch they are with everyday Americans. Instead of addressing the skyrocketing costs of gasoline across the country, they have now passed the buck onto American families by telling them to spend tens of thousands of dollars on a brand-new electric vehicle. Since President Biden took office in January, inflation has soared to its highest level in over 30 years, with gas prices rising over 69 percent from $2.42 a gallon on average to $3.49 with no signs of stopping or even slowing down. In fact, the cost of consumer goods has risen so much that purchasing an electric vehicle is impossible for a majority of American families. According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics’ Consumer Price Index, the cost of new vehicles has increased 9.8 percent since last year, and for those looking to save money by purchasing a used vehicle, they are looking at a 26.4 percent increase in cost. […] Americans’ pocketbooks are hurting due to the failed policies and excessive spending of this Administration. It is unacceptable that they have failed to take accountability and now expect families to accept the fact that they are doing nothing to lower gas prices and other consumer goods. We need to be working to help families, not hurting them.” [Iowa Torch, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks Op-Ed, 12/7/21]

**Miller-Meeks Was Concerned That Democrats’ Budget Would Put The Country In Economic Jeopardy And Create Inflation.** “Miller-Meeks is prepared to vote for the infrastructure plan, but — as for the larger spending bill — she is concerned that it would put the country in economic jeopardy. ‘When you’re chasing too much, you have inflation. We’ve already seen inflation … People aren’t feeling the effect of having an increase in their salary, because it’s costing them more to buy food,’ Miller-Meeks said.” [Daily Iowan, 10/17/21]

**Miller-Meeks Said There Was “Too Much Money” And “Wasteful Spending” That Was “Pushed Into Economy Primed To Grow At End Of Pandemic Fueling Inflation.”** “Too much money (ie wasteful spending) pushed into economy primed to grow at end of pandemic fueling inflation. Keep up the great work Bryan!” QUOTE TWEET @RepBryanStiel: “Prices jumping five percent in May is hitting everyone’s pocketbooks. Inflation functions as a tax on everyone by raising costs from gasoline to food to lumber. We must work against wasteful spending to protect Americans’ pocketbooks.” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 6/10/21]

**Miller-Meeks: Inflation Was “Not A Surprise To Many Of Us Who Looked At The Spending Proposals Of The Current Administration.”** “Miller-Meeks touched on the unemployment rate in the United States and how previous spending habits could lead to inflation. Miller-Meeks brought up how the administrative decisions, such as canceling the Keystone Pipeline, could contribute to the problem. ‘Personally, I think it was not a surprise to many
of us who looked at the spending proposals of the current administration — almost 7 trillion over a period of four months — and thought that that would lead to inflation,’ Miller-Meeks said.” [Oskaloosa Herald, 5/27/21]
**COVID-19 And Pandemic Relief**

**Significant Findings**

- In July 2021, Miller-Meeks falsely claimed elementary-school-aged children did not transmit COVID-19 to each other or adults, in arguing that requiring mask mandates in schools was “not following the science.”
  - An Ottumwa Courier editorial called Miller-Meeks’ claim “patently false” and a Cedar Rapids Gazette fact check gave her “inaccurate” claim a “D” grade.

- In September 2021, Miller-Meeks tweeted a false story from a clearly marked parody website about Biden ordering the VA to withhold benefits from unvaccinated veterans, adding “If true, this is insane!”
  - Miller-Meeks stood by her decision to share misinformation that veterans’ benefits were at risk, claiming the false story made a “powerful point.”
  - The false story was so widely shared after Miller-Meeks posted it that a Georgia VA hospital was forced to send an emergency alert, assuring veterans their benefits were not threatened.

- Miller-Meeks repeatedly undermined efforts to encourage vaccination by promoting natural immunity as superior to vaccine-acquired immunity, including through false characterization of CDC data.

- Miller-Meeks promoted hydroxychloroquine as a COVID treatment, despite medical consensus that it was ineffective or even harmful.

- Miller-Meeks suggested lockdowns, isolation, and hospital closures caused more excess deaths than COVID-19 itself had caused.
  - Miller-Meeks’ claim that early pandemic closures limiting hospital services had caused 98,000 deaths unrelated to COVID was given a “C” grade by a Cedar Rapids Gazette fact check.
  - Miller-Meeks said in May 2020 that she would have recommended a 2–3-week shutdown of businesses and travel during the start of the pandemic if consulted by President Trump, but later said she opposed pandemic closures.

- Shortly before the 2020 election, Miller-Meeks called for another round of direct stimulus payments to households and an extension of expanded pandemic unemployment insurance.
  - However, after President Biden took office, Miller-Meeks flip-flopped, saying it was too soon to consider further stimulus payments and blaming pandemic UI for causing labor shortages by discouraging work.

- Miller-Meeks voted against the American Rescue Plan and condemned it as “only tangentially related to the COVID pandemic.”

- Miller-Meeks opposed mask mandates and was fined $2500 for repeated violations of the House’s COVID protocols by refusing to wear a mask while on the House floor.
  - Miller-Meeks used her refusal to obey House COVID protocol as the basis for a fundraising appeal.
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- Miller-Meeks had previously refused to wear a mask on the Iowa Senate floor in 2020, arguing that maintaining 6 feet of distance from others was sufficient protection because the virus “scientifically […] is not aerosolized” and was not transmitted through the air, a flatly inaccurate statement.

- Miller-Meeks refused to answer a reporter’s questions at a fundraiser because the reporter would not remove his mask.

- Miller-Meeks opposed vaccine mandates, co-sponsoring legislation to undermine the Biden Administration’s proposed vaccine rules, but said prior to the 2020 election that she favored a vaccine mandate for children to attend school.

  - Miller-Meeks said she herself was vaccinated and boasted she had personally administered vaccinations in every county of her district.

  - Miller-Meeks claimed unvaccinated people were not a risk to others and criticized the “pitting of vaccinated people against unvaccinated people.

- Miller-Meeks criticized school closures and remote learning throughout 2020 and 2021, but in April 2020 said that remote learning helped control the cost of education and could be a model for reducing college costs.

- Miller-Meeks voted to shield businesses and health facilities from liability related to COVID exposure.

  - Miller-Meeks dismissed reports that meatpacking companies were responsible for outbreaks among workers at their plants, claiming most cases among workers at a JBS plant in Ottumwa were not contracted inside the plant.

---

**Miller-Meeks Was A Serial Spreader Of COVID-Related Misinformation**

**July 2021: Miller-Meeks Falsely Claimed Children Do Not Transmit COVID-19 And That Requiring Masks In School Was “Not Following The Science”**

Miller-Meeks Claimed Elementary Age Students “Don’t Transmit [COVID-19] To Adults Or Other Children.” “Been saying this since last summer. Teachers can be protected. Elementary age students rarely die or are seriously ill and don’t transmit virus to adults or other children. Global poverty has exploded also and will take decades to reverse.” QUOTE TWEET @UNICEF: “To prevent the COVID-19 pandemic from having a life-long impact on an entire generation of children and young people - especially the most vulnerable, governments must reopen schools and recover lost learning.” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 7/17/21]

Miller-Meeks: “We Have Known For Over A Year That Children Don’t Transmit The Virus.” MACDONALD: “Major push back now against Dr. Fauci. He says children age 2 or older should wear masks, but the WHO says children under age 5 don’t need to wear masks. There’s a lot of confusion about this. What do you say to this?” MILLER-MEEKS: “It’s the same reason why there’s vaccine hesitancy and that’s because we continue to get mixed messages from the so-called experts. So, the WHO has said children under 5 don’t need to wear masks. Even as far back as almost a year ago, the American Journal of Pediatrics had published that children don’t transmit. So, children up to the elementary school age, so that would be up until 6th grade, don’t transmit the virus to other children or to adults. Children get the virus from other adults, but they weren’t transmitting it. And that may be because they have a better immune system and a better T-cell immune system, but nonetheless, we have known for over a year that children don’t transmit the virus.” [Fox Business, 7/14/21] (VIDEO) 00:00:57
Miller-Meeks: “To Say We’re Not Going To Let Children Go Back To School Unless They’re Wearing Masks Is Not Following The Science.” “We have known for over a year that children don’t transmit the virus. So delaying children going to summer camps, being outdoors where there’s almost infinitesimally low transmission, it seems absurd to have children wearing masks when they’re outdoors playing in sports and certainly in the elementary age group. I think to say we’re not going to let children go back to school unless they’re wearing masks is not following the science.” [Fox Business, 7/14/21] (VIDEO) 00:01:50

Cedar Rapids Gazette Fact Check Gave Miller-Meeks’ Claim That Children Do Not Transmit COVID-19 A “D” Grade, Noted It Was “Inaccurate” And “Contradicts New CDC Recommendations.” “Miller-Meeks, an ophthalmologist, has been a vocal advocate for Iowans to get the COVID-19 vaccine. But her claims about children not transmitting the virus are inaccurate. Kids can and do pass the virus, although at much lower rates than adults. If Miller-Meeks had qualified her statement even a little, saying children usually don’t transmit the virus, she’d be correct. But she didn’t. And she uses the claim as a reason for saying children don’t need to wear masks in school — a conclusion that contradicts new CDC recommendations. Her statement that ‘elementary age students rarely die or are seriously ill’ is true, which saves her overall grade from an F. Instead, we give her a D.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 8/2/21]

Ottumwa Courier Editorial: Miller-Meeks’ Statement That Children Do Not Transmit COVID-19 Was “Patently False.” “In July, she tweeted that children ‘don’t transmit virus to adults or other children.’ She appeared on a Fox Business show with a similar message. We know that statement is patently false. Last week, children accounted for a third of new cases in Iowa.” [Ottumwa Courier, Editorial, 9/14/21]

Cedar Rapids Gazette’s Todd Dorman: “Despite U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks Recent False Claims To The Contrary, Children Can Transmit The Virus, Potentially To Vulnerable Adults At Home.” “A troubling number of cases among children are being recorded in regions where the delta variant is running wild. From the end of July to Aug. 6, the CDC reported an average of 216 children hospitalized daily. And despite U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks recent false claims to the contrary, children can transmit the virus, potentially to vulnerable adults at home.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, Todd Dorman, 8/12/21]

**Miller-Meeks Created A Firestorm Of Controversy By Spreading Disinformation Suggesting Unvaccinated Veterans Would Lose Their Health Benefits**

September 2021: Miller-Meeks Tweeted A False Story About Biden Ordering The VA To Withhold Health Benefits From Unvaccinated Veterans And Suggested It Could Be True

September 2021: Miller-Meeks Shared A Story Claiming That Biden Ordered The VA To Withhold Health Benefits From Unvaccinated Veterans, Adding “If True, This Is Insane!”
The Story Was From Delaware Ohio News, A Satirical Website That Stated On Its Home Page, “Everything On This Website Is Made Up. Do Not Rely On Anything Said Here.” “With all of that said, everything on this website is made up. Do not rely on anything said here.”

Quad-City Times: “Nothing In Miller-Meeks’ Tweet Sharing The Fictional Story, However, Indicates That It Is Satirical, And Instead Insinuates That It Might Be True.” “Democrats and others on Monday blasted Iowa freshman Republican U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks for sharing a fake news article from a satirical online news website falsely claiming Democratic President Joe Biden’s administration of planning to withhold health benefits from unvaccinated veterans. […] Nothing in Miller-Meeks' tweet sharing the fictional story, however, indicates that it is satirical, and instead insinuates that it might be true. A representative for Miller-Meeks did not respond to follow up questions.” [Quad-City Times, 9/13/21]

KCRG: Miller-Meeks Sent A Tweet “Falsely Claiming That President Biden Will Withhold Medical Benefits
From Unvaccinated Veterans’” “A tweet by Representative Mariannette Miller-Meeks is causing confusion falsely claiming that President Biden will withhold medical benefits from unvaccinated veterans. The link was shared late Sunday night by Miller-Meeks’ Twitter account. Miller-Meeks, a Republican representing Iowa’s second congressional district, tweeted, ‘If true, this is insane!’ The tweet directed readers to an article claiming that the President will ‘withhold healthcare benefits from unvaccinated veterans as part of an aggressive new initiative to combat the COVID-19 pandemic.’ The article appears on the website DelawareOhioNews.com, a self-described parody website that cautions its readers with a warning, ‘... everything on this website is made up. Do not rely on anything said here.’” [KCRG, 9/13/21]

HEADLINE: “Iowa Congresswoman Tweets Misinformation About Biden, Unvaccinated Veterans.” [WOI, 9/13/21]

Miller-Meeks Stood By Her Decision To Share Misinformation That Veterans’ Benefits Were At Risk, Claiming The Fake Story Made A “Powerful Point”

WOI: Miller-Meeks Was “Standing By Her Decision To Share Misinformation About President Joe Biden And His Actions To Combat The COVID-19 Pandemic.” “Iowa Republican Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks is standing by her decision to share misinformation about President Joe Biden and his actions to combat the COVID-19 pandemic. On Sunday evening, Miller-Meeks tweeted a link to a satirical article from the website DelawareOhioNews.com. She added the statement, ‘If true, this is insane!’ The article describes a fake announcement from President Biden regarding unvaccinated veterans losing their health benefits from the Department of Veteran Affairs. Biden made no such announcement. A disclaimer on DelawareOhioNews.com states, ‘All stories herein are parodies (satire, fiction, fake, not real) of people and/or actual events. All names are made up (unless used in a parody of public figures) and any similarity is purely coincidental.’” [WOI, 9/13/21]

Miller-Meeks Said The Satirical Story She Shared About Unvaccinated Veterans Being Denied Benefits Made “A Powerful Point.” “Local 5 asked Miller-Meeks for an interview regarding her decision to spread misinformation online through the article, satirical or not. Misinformation is defined as false information that is spread, regardless of intent to mislead. Miller-Meeks declined an interview but provided this statement: ‘I retweeted a story about President Biden requiring the VA to withhold benefits from unvaccinated veterans, saying ‘if true, this is insane.’ The story and website is obviously satire and makes a powerful point. President Biden’s executive orders about COVID-19 have been classic examples of government overreach and these days the unbelievable has become reality.’” [WOI, 9/13/21]

Miller-Meeks’ Spokesperson Declined To Clarify What “Powerful Point” The Article Made. “Local 5 asked for clarification on what ‘powerful point’ the article made, but a spokesperson declined to further clarify.” [WOI, 9/13/21]

The False Story Was Shared Widely After Miller-Meeks Tweeted It, Forcing A Georgia VA Hospital To Send An Emergency Alert Assuring Veterans Their Benefits Were Safe

October 2021: A VA Hospital In Georgia Sent An Emergency Email Alert To Inform Veterans That The Story Miller-Meeks Shared About Unvaccinated Veterans Losing Their Benefits Was Not True. “A Department of Veterans Affairs hospital in Georgia sent an emergency email alert Friday about a false news story on a satirical site that veterans are misconstruing as true. The false article states President Joe Biden ordered the VA to withhold health care benefits from veterans who refuse to receive coronavirus vaccines. The story was published by DelawareOhioNews.com, which describes itself as a satire and parody entertainment website. The Carl Vinson VA Medical Center in Dublin, Ga., issued an email alert Friday to inform veterans that the article is not true. ‘It’s sick,’ the email reads. ‘There is nothing funny about spreading false stories of stripping our heroes of their hard-earned benefits.’ The false article was posted online in September. It was shared widely after a Republican lawmaker from Iowa, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, tweeted about it. Along with a link to the story, she tweeted: ‘If true, this is insane!’ As of Friday, Miller-Meeks tweet had not been deleted, despite the story being marked as satire.” [Stars And Stripes, 10/22/21]
• Stars And Stripes: “The False Article […] Was Shared Widely After A Republican Lawmaker from Iowa, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Tweeted About It.” “The false article was posted online in September. It was shared widely after a Republican lawmaker from Iowa, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, tweeted about it. Along with a link to the story, she tweeted: ‘If true, this is insane!’ As of Friday, Miller-Meeks tweet had not been deleted, despite the story being marked as satire.” [Stars And Stripes, 10/22/21]

Editorials Slammed Miller-Meeks For Spreading Misinformation And For Dismissing Concerns That Her Constituents Took It As Fact

Quad-City Times Editorial Board Gave Miller-Meeks A “Thumbs Down” For “Spreading Misinformation About The Coronavirus And The Biden Administration's Response To It” By “Claiming The Administration Had Instructed The VA To Withhold Benefits From Unvaccinated Veterans.” “Thumbs Down … to Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks for spreading misinformation about the coronavirus and the Biden administration's response to it. Earlier this week, the first-term congresswoman circulated an article on Twitter from a web site claiming the administration had instructed the VA to withhold benefits from unvaccinated veterans. ‘If true, that's insane,’ she tweeted. Of course, the story was false. Anybody with a modicum of common sense could see that. But if that wasn’t enough, it was easy to see the article came from a parody site, delewareohionews.com, which notes on its site that is isn't a real source of information: ‘All stories herein are parodies (satire, fiction, fake, not real).’” [Quad-City Times, Editorial, 9/18/21]

• Quad-City Times Editorial: “Of Course, The Story Was False. Anybody With A Modicum Of Common Sense Could See That.” “Thumbs Down … to Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks for spreading misinformation about the coronavirus and the Biden administration's response to it. Earlier this week, the first-term congresswoman circulated an article on Twitter from a web site claiming the administration had instructed the VA to withhold benefits from unvaccinated veterans. ‘If true, that's insane,’ she tweeted. Of course, the story was false. Anybody with a modicum of common sense could see that. But if that wasn’t enough, it was easy to see the article came from a parody site, delewareohionews.com, which notes on its site that is isn't a real source of information: ‘All stories herein are parodies (satire, fiction, fake, not real).’” [Quad-City Times, Editorial, 9/18/21]

• Quad-City Times Editorial: Miller-Meeks “Left The Phony Article On Her Twitter Feed, Despite Calls For Her To Take It Down; Then She Defended Her Actions And Complained When People Criticized Her For It.” “Of course, the story was false. Anybody with a modicum of common sense could see that. But if that wasn’t enough, it was easy to see the article came from a parody site, delewareohionews.com, which notes on its site that is isn't a real source of information: ‘All stories herein are parodies (satire, fiction, fake, not real).’ That didn’t seem to bother Miller-Meeks, who represents Iowa's 2nd District in Congress. She left the phony article on her Twitter feed, despite calls for her to take it down; then she defended her actions and complained when people criticized her for it.” [Quad-City Times, Editorial, 9/18/21]

Ottumwa Courier Editorial On Miller-Meeks’ COVID Misinformation: “Mariannette Miller-Meeks Can, And Must, Do Better.” “Mariannette Miller-Meeks can, and must, do better. The freshman Republican that represents Iowa's second congressional district in the U.S. House of Representatives has done some good things in her short tenure. But, particularly recently, has shown a concerning detachment from facts and reality — and now a refusal to apologize for it. On Sunday night she retweeted a story from the website Delaware Ohio News. It's a satire website, meaning its content is made up. It doesn't hide this fact; the site even has posted a legal statement to make clear that all stories are ‘satire, fiction, fake, not real.’” [Ottumwa Courier, Editorial, 9/14/21]

Ottumwa Courier Editorial: Miller-Meeks Had “Shown A Concerning Detachment From Facts And Reality — And Now A Refusal To Apologize For It.” “Mariannette Miller-Meeks can, and must, do better. The freshman Republican that represents Iowa's second congressional district in the U.S. House of Representatives has done some good things in her short tenure. But, particularly recently, has shown a concerning detachment from facts and reality — and now a refusal to apologize for it. On Sunday night she retweeted a story from the website Delaware
Ohio News. It's a satire website, meaning its content is made up. It doesn't hide this fact; the site even has posted a legal statement to make clear that all stories are 'satire, fiction, fake, not real.’” [Ottumwa Courier, Editorial, 9/14/21]

Ottumwa Courier Editorial: When Asked About Her Sharing Of COVID Misinformation, Miller-Meeks Was “Dismissive And Deflected.” “On Sunday night she retweeted a story from the website Delaware Ohio News. It's a satire website, meaning its content is made up. [...] In a statement provided to some media outlets, Miller-Meeks was dismissive and deflected: 'I retweeted a story about President Biden requiring the VA to withhold benefits from unvaccinated veterans, saying 'if true, this is insane.’ The story and website is obviously satire and makes a powerful point. President Biden’s executive orders about COVID-19 have been classic examples of government overreach and these days the unbelievable has become reality.” [Ottumwa Courier, Editorial, 9/14/21]

Ottumwa Courier Editorial: Miller-Meeks Offered “No Apology Or Clarification” For Retweeting COVID Misinformation That “Caused Confusion Among Some Of Her Constituents, Some Of Which Seem To Believe The Story Is True.” “The headline of this completely fake, made-up news story read, 'Biden Orders VA To Withhold Health Benefits From Unvaccinated Veterans.' Miller-Meeks' retweet comment was 'If true, this is insane!' [...] The tweet remains up two days later. There has been no apology or clarification other than to some members of the press. Clearly it has caused confusion among some of her constituents, some of which seem to believe the story is true.” [Ottumwa Courier, Editorial, 9/14/21]

Miller-Meeks Repeatedly Undermined Efforts To Promote Vaccination By Promoting Natural Immunity From COVID-19 As Superior To Vaccine-Acquired Immunity

Miller-Meeks: “We Should Be Highlighting Immunity, Including Infection Acquired Or Natural Immunity And Not Just Mandating Vaccines And Boosters.” “Which is why we should be highlighting immunity, including infection acquired or natural immunity and not just mandating vaccines and boosters. My bill requiring coverage of serology for antibodies & T-cell antibodies documents immunity.” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 12/18/21]

Miller-Meeks Suggested That Public Health Officials Should Recommend COVID-19 Testing Rather Than Boosters For Children And Those With Previous Infection And That Those Boosters Should Be Sent Overseas. MILLER-MEEKS: “We had five public health experts just recently in this hearing, asked them about infection-acquired immunity, asked them about the Israeli study, and all of them were less than supportive of evidence-based data that has come out about infection-acquired immunity. I put forward a bill to mandate all insurance, both private and federal, cover for serology testing for humoral antibodies and also T-cell antibodies, because we know the T-cell immunity is stronger and lasts longer. But yet, as you’re indicating, when we’re talking about trying to globally vaccinate countries, we’re vaccinating now children 16 to 17, and recommending boosters for individuals who may already have immunity rather than recommending testing for that. We don’t know in children, because the CDC, and I’ve asked this of Doctor Walensky, for those children who have died of COVID-19, what were their risk factors, what were their vulnerabilities? That’s information that we should know before recommending that every child be vaccinated, from the ages of 5-12 or 5-11, and then recommend boosters. Because as I think you indicated, would you agree those boosters could be doses that could go overseas to other countries in order to increase the rates of immunization?” [YouTube, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 12/14/21] (VIDEO) 00:04:52

Miller-Meeks: Infection-Acquired Immunity Was “As Beneficial As Vaccination, And In Some Cases More Beneficial.” MILLER-MEEKS: “And it seems to me that when we do not recognize infection-acquired immunity, which does provide immunity—the studies that have come out of Israel and other studies have shown that it is as beneficial as vaccination, and in some cases more beneficial because it’s not only to the spike protein—that we’re not addressing that and we could have the same accommodations for individuals in the workplace as we’ve had throughout the pandemic knowing that most infections occur at home or elsewhere outside the workplace.” [YouTube, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 10/25/21] (VIDEO) 00:04:13

October 2021: Miller-Meeks Cosponsored A Bill Requiring Federal Agencies To Consider Immunity From
Previous COVID-19 Infection When Issuing New Rules Or Regulations Regarding COVID-19. “Today, Florida Congressman Daniel Webster, R-Clermont, joined Congresswoman Diana Harshbarger (R-TN) to introduce the Natural Immunity is Real Act in the U.S. House of Representatives. This bill requires federal agencies to take into account naturally acquired immunity from previous COVID-19 infection when issuing any rules or regulations aimed at protecting from COVID-19. […] Additional co-sponsors include: Jeff Van Drew (R-NJ), Chris Steward (R-UT), Bill Posey (R-FL), Mary Miller (R-IL), Mariannette Miller-Meeks (R-IA), Dan Bishop (R-NC), Mo Brooks (R-AL), Madison Cawthorn (R-NC), and Chip Roy (R-TX).” [Office Of Rep. Daniel Webster, Press Release, 10/18/21]

Miller-Meeks Promoted A COVID-19 Study Showing That “‘Immunized’ Family Members Provided Protection Whether Immunity From Vax Or Infection Acquired (Natural).” “Study stressed that ‘immunized’ family members provided protection whether immunity from vax or infection acquired (natural). You address this in your analysis. As a nation we desire immunity for protection and this study indicates conferred from either route.” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 10/15/21]

Miller-Meeks: “I Still Believe There Should Not Be A Mandate” For The COVID-19 Vaccine “And We Should Recognize Natural Immunity, Which We Still Do Not Do.” “Miller-Meeks drew even louder cheers from the crowd of 200 when she called for the resignations of top U-S generals and the U.S. secretary of state. Miller-Meeks also criticized the Biden Administration’s recent move to fine companies with more than 100 employees who do not ensure workers have had a Covid shot or are regularly tested for the virus. ‘Make no mistake, I’ve given vaccine in all 24 counties. I talk to people about the vaccine. I try to persuade them for the vaccine, but I still believe there should not be a mandate and we should recognize natural immunity, which we still do not do,’ she said, to applause.” [Radio Iowa, 9/19/21]

• Iowa City Press-Citizen: “Experts Say That Natural Immunity Is Not A Solution To COVID-19, Since Catching The Virus And Surviving Does Not Give You Enough Protective Antibodies As Does Getting An mRNA Vaccine Like The Moderna Or Pfizer Shot.” “Natural immunity to the COVID-19 pandemic would entail someone catching the virus and recovering from it, giving their immune system experience fighting off the virus. Experts say that natural immunity is not a solution to COVID-19, since catching the virus and surviving does not give you enough protective antibodies as does getting an mRNA vaccine like the Moderna or Pfizer shot.” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 9/18/21]

Miller-Meeks: Biden’s Vaccine Mandate Had “No Recognition Of Natural Immunity Which Is Rapidly Seen As Better” And It Would Be “Challenged In The Courts.” “So why a mandate now? Could Biden’s favorability on handling the pandemic be worsening? Why exempt the postal service? And no recognition of natural immunity which is rapidly seen as better? I support vaccination, but NOT mandate. Gov’t overreach will be challenged in the courts.” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 9/9/21]

After A Professor Was Granted A COVID-19 Vaccine Exemption Due To Prior Infection, Miller-Meeks Said It Was “Extraordinary That One Should Even Have To Go To Court To Prove Science Of Naturalized Immunity Which Was Commonly Acknowledged And Accepted Prior To COVID.” “Great news, but extraordinary that one should even have to go to court to prove science of naturalized immunity which was commonly acknowledged and accepted prior to COVID.” QUOTE TWEET @MartinKulldorff: “After lawsuit, @GeorgeMasonU grants professor @ToddZywicky a medical exemption to #COVID vaccine. He already has excellent immunity from prior COVID infection.” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 8/18/21]

Miller-Meeks Said Previous Infection With COVID-19 Should Be Sufficient To Bypass An Employer Vaccine Mandate. MILLER-MEEKS: “Well, I don't think that we should have a federal mandate for the COVID-19 vaccines. But interestingly enough, working in the hospitals in which I was a staff member, hospitals required us to get vaccinated for influenza. Now, you could appeal that decision or you could ask for a waiver if you had a medical reason that you could not be vaccinated, if you had an allergy, or if you had previous, and I think in this case, if you can show that you've had previous infection with COVID-19, you ought to be able to use that for an employer. So, I think no vaccine mandate by the federal government, but I certainly understand businesses wanting
to protect all of their employees and their customers, and so they may ask for an individual to provide a waiver and/or waiver liability.” [Fox Business, 6/14/21] (VIDEO) 00:02:50

Miller-Meeks Falsely Characterized CDC Data To Claim That It Showed Natural Immunity Was Equally Effective As Vaccination At Preventing Infection

Miller-Meeks Claimed That The CDC’s Morbidity And Mortality Weekly Report Showed That “Infection-Acquired Immunity Is As Equally Effective As Vaccine Immunity.” MILLER-MEEKS: “However, this week, in the Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report from the CDC, we find that infection-acquired immunity is as equally effective as vaccine immunity. So, we should be talking about immunity and getting people immune.” [YouTube, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 11/5/21] (VIDEO) 00:00:45

- The CDC’s Report Showed That Unvaccinated Adults With Previous COVID-19 Infection Were 5.49 Times More Likely To Get COVID-19 Than Fully Vaccinated Individuals With No Previous Infection. “Among COVID-19–like illness hospitalizations among adults aged ≥18 years whose previous infection or vaccination occurred 90–179 days earlier, the adjusted odds of laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 among unvaccinated adults with previous SARS-CoV-2 infection were 5.49-fold higher than the odds among fully vaccinated recipients of an mRNA COVID-19 vaccine who had no previous documented infection (95% confidence interval = 2.75–10.99).” [Centers For Disease Control And Prevention, 11/5/21]

- CDC: “Vaccine-Induced Immunity Was More Protective Than Infection-Induced Immunity Against Laboratory-Confirmed COVID-19.” “In this U.S.-based epidemiologic analysis of patients hospitalized with COVID-19–like illness whose previous infection or vaccination occurred 90–179 days earlier, vaccine-induced immunity was more protective than infection-induced immunity against laboratory-confirmed COVID-19, including during a period of Delta variant predominance. All eligible persons should be vaccinated against COVID-19 as soon as possible, including unvaccinated persons previously infected with SARS-CoV-2.” [Centers For Disease Control And Prevention, 11/5/21]

Miller-Meeks On COVID-19: “Immunity, Not Merely Vaccination, Is What Is Important.” “Immunity, not merely vaccination, is what is important and why we should test for both humoral antibodies and T-cells.” QUOTE TWEET @Pantera793: “Of note, we detected cross-reactive T cell responses directed against the spike and/or membrane proteins of SARS-CoV-2 in 28% of unexposed healthy blood donors, consistent with a high degree of pre-existing immunity in the general population”’ [Twitter, @millermeeks, 10/31/21]

- October 2021: The CDC Published Data “Reinforcing That Vaccination Is The Best Protection Against COVID-19” And Finding That Vaccination Was Superior To Immunity From Prior Infection. “Today, CDC published new science reinforcing that vaccination is the best protection against COVID-19. In a new MMWR examining more than 7,000 people across 9 states who were hospitalized with COVID-like illness, CDC found that those who were unvaccinated and had a recent infection were 5 times more likely to have COVID-19 than those who were recently fully vaccinated and did not have a prior infection.” [Centers For Disease Control And Prevention, Press Release, 10/29/21]

- CDC: “Vaccination Can Provide A Higher, More Robust, And More Consistent Level Of Immunity To Protect People From Hospitalization For COVID-19 Than Infection Alone For At Least 6 Months.” “The data demonstrate that vaccination can provide a higher, more robust, and more consistent level of immunity to protect people from hospitalization for COVID-19 than infection alone for at least 6 months.” [Centers For Disease Control And Prevention, Press Release, 10/29/21]

Ottumwa Courier Editorial: Miller-Meeks “Promoted Natural Immunity As Being Supreme To COVID-19 Vaccinations” When “There Isn't Enough Information To Make That Statement.” “Sunday's Tweet was far from her first offense. Miller-Meeks — an eye doctor and not an expert on vaccines or infectious disease — has promoted natural immunity as being supreme to COVID-19 vaccinations. There isn't enough information to make that statement, and currently, peer-reviewed studies point to vaccinations offering better immunity. Last month, the
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention released a study that showed a vaccination against COVID-19 offered more protection than previous infection. This means two things: those who have had COVID should still get vaccinated, and those who haven't gotten COVID should get vaccinated. [Ottumwa Courier, Editorial, 9/14/21]

**Miller-Meeks Promoted Hydroxychloroquine As A COVID Treatment In Defiance Of Medical Consensus**

**Miller-Meeks Criticized Regulations That Prevented Doctors From Prescribing Alternative Drugs For COVID Patients.** “While Miller-Meeks did not directly cite medications that have primarily been used to treat malaria or to deworm livestock, she criticized regulations during the pandemic which have prevented doctors from prescribing alternative drugs for Covid patients. ‘We’ve had governors make decisions over what drugs doctors can prescribe their patients under the penalty of doctors losing their license,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘We’ve seen government bureaucracy interfere with the doctor-patient relationship, whether it’s prescribing treatments, what they can get through hospitalization.’” [Radio Iowa, 11/5/21]

**March 2020: Miller-Meeks Tweeted And Then Deleted “If I Were Seriously Ill From COVID-19, Having Read The Research, I Would Want To Try Hydroxychloroquine.”** “State Sen. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, a physician and Republican candidate for Congress, said in a tweet if she became infected with COVID-19, she would want to try a malaria drug for treatment that a new, large study shows has no benefit and may have worsened health outcomes. In the March 22 tweet, which has since been deleted, Miller-Meeks said: ‘As an ophthalmologist, I take care of people frequently who are on hydroxychloroquine. It has a high safety profile and if I were seriously ill from COVID-19, having read the research, I would want to try hydroxychloroquine.’” On March 21, President Donald Trump promoted the drug, calling it ‘a real chance to be one of the biggest game changers in the history of medicine.’ …be put in use IMMEDIATELY. PEOPLE ARE DYING, MOVE FAST, and GOD BLESS EVERYONE! @US_FDA @SteveFDA @CDCgov @DHSgov — Donald J. Trump (@realDonaldTrump) March 21, 2020 A new study of the drug’s impact on coronavirus patients showed no benefit and potentially did more harm than good when used on 368 men at Veterans Health Administration medical centers across the country.” [Iowa Starting Line, 4/22/20]

**Miller-Meeks’ Tweet About Hydroxychloroquine Was Posted One Day After Trump Praised The Unauthorized Treatment.** “In a since deleted March 22 social media post, Miller-Meeks, a physician and state senator from Ottumwa, said that if she contracted COVID-19, she would want to be placed on a treatment of hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin. That was posted a day after President Donald Trump said hydroxychloroquine was ‘a real chance to be one of the biggest game changers in the history of medicine.’ ‘Iowans deserve to know that in the middle of a global pandemic, Mariannette Miller-Meeks recklessly touted a drug that
scientific evidence shows caused even more death in coronavirus patients,’ said Brooke Goren of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee. ‘If Miller-Meeks is already putting politics ahead of patients now, how can Iowans trust her to put them ahead of partisan gamesmanship in Washington?’” [Quad-City Times, 6/25/20]

**HEADLINE:** Iowa Starting Line: “IA-02: Miller-Meeks Touted Unproven Malaria Drug For COVID Cases.” [Iowa Starting Line, 4/22/20]

---

### Miller-Meeks Suggested Lockdowns And Hospital Closures Caused More Excess Deaths Than COVID-19 Itself

**December 2021:** Miller-Meeks Alleged That There Had Been More “Excess Deaths” Resulting From COVID-19 Lockdowns And Isolations Than Excess Deaths From Cases Of COVID-19. MILLER-MEEKS: “I think that one of the costs of the pandemic and how we’ve responded to the pandemic -- I’ve addressed with Dr. Walensky and Dr Fauci and the subcommittee and the coronavirus task force -- is the number of excess deaths. We now know the number of excess deaths from how we handled COVID-19 with lockdowns, isolation, and banning social gatherings, that that has led to excess deaths which are now in excess of what has happened from COVID19 - - if in fact all deaths were COVID-19 and not somebody hospitalized with COVID-19.” [YouTube, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks M.D., 12/2/21] (VIDEO) 00:02:47

Miller-Meeks Compared 277 COVID-19 Deaths In Children To Child Death Tolls From Influenza, H1N1, And Drowning. ‘COVID-19 deaths in children were 277 through the end of April. To put this in perspective, the CDC estimates around 600 children died of influenza in 2017-2018 season, 358 died during the 2009 H1N1 pandemic and each year, more than 700 children die from drowning. We can see the light at the end of this pandemic tunnel, and as the number of Americans who are vaccinated continues to grow, coupled with those who have natural immunity from having the disease, I expect to see a return to normalcy and return to a pre-pandemic life.’ [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 5/12/21] (VIDEO)

Cedar Rapids Gazette Gave Miller-Meeks' Debate Claim That Early COVID-19 Pandemic Shutdowns Had Caused 98,000 Deaths Unrelated To Covid-19 From Limited Hospital Services A 'C' Rating. 'In this check, we'll hit on two debate claims from Miller-Meeks, an ophthalmologist and state senator. Claim 1: 'The CDC has already said over 98,000 people had non-COVID related deaths because of hospitals that were closed down for non-essential services,' Miller-Meeks said as an example of a side effect of shutdowns in the early months of the pandemic. It seems like it would be easy enough to check her statement. After all, she said she got the information from the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. However, the Miller-Meeks campaign did not respond to the Fact Checker's request for its sourcing, so we had to guess what research she was referencing. [...] It's possible some of these excess deaths were due to shutdowns of non-emergency procedures, as Miller-Meeks said, but it's also possible there were other reasons — like people deciding not to seek care because they feared contracting the disease. But emergency rooms didn't close. Grade: Miller-Meeks said more than 98,000 Americans died 'because hospitals were closed down for non-essential services,' but the reasons for these excess deaths haven't been confirmed by the research by the CDC or other organizations. The number she cited is through early October, while medical services shutdowns were shorter. We give her a C.’ [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 10/26/20]

---

### Economic Relief

**Weeks Before The 2020 Election, Miller Meeks Called For Another Round Of Direct Stimulus Payments And An Extension Of Unemployment Insurance…**

October 2020: Miller-Meeks Said Congress Needed To Act Quickly On A Bipartisan Solution To Provide Another Wave Of COVID-19 Relief Including Additional Unemployment Benefits. “Miller-Meeks, in last week's Quad-City Times/KWQC TV6 debate, agreed that Congress needs to act quickly on a bipartisan solution to provide another wave of coronavirus relief, including additional unemployment benefits. On immigration reform, Hart said she supports a strong southern border, but that Congress must craft humanitarian immigration reform that
recognizes immigrants are an important part of growing Iowa's economy and filling workforce gaps.” [Quad-City Times, 10/22/20]

September 2020: Miller-Meeks Said She Supported A Second Round Of Pandemic Stimulus Checks And Unemployment Insurance Increases Reflecting Ongoing Negotiations. “Second pandemic stimulus: Both candidates supported a second round of stimulus checks to be issued, supporting the millions of people out of work during the coronavirus pandemic, as well as the increased unemployment benefits. Miller-Meeks said the amount of that increase should reflect ongoing negotiations.” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 9/25/20]

October 2020: Miller-Meeks Called The Hiatus In Negotiations Over Another Relief Package “Disappointing.” “As the debate largely centered on the pandemic, the two agreed that Congress should take swift action to reach bipartisan solutions. Negotiations on more government aid have stalled in Congress as President Donald Trump waffles on pressing the legislative branch to pass a relief package. Trump had tweeted Tuesday that he 'instructed my representatives to stop negotiating until after the election,’ though hours later, he urged Congress to pass a new relief bill. […] Miller-Meeks agreed that the hiatus in negotiations over another relief package was 'disappointing,’ especially seeing firsthand the struggling individuals and small businesses in her town. Another bill should provide additional Paycheck Protection Program funds, address unemployment and facilitate Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program benefits - popularly known as food stamps - to help those with food insecurity, Miller-Meeks said. She touted Iowa's 'conservative fiscal practices’ as helping the state better brace for the pandemic than other states, taking aim at three states under Democratic control. "You can't expect the taxpayers of Iowa to bailout Illinois or New York or California for their poor fiscal practices,” Miller-Meeks said.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 10/8/20]

January 2021: Miller-Meeks Said She Thought It Was Too Soon To Consider Another Round Of Direct Payments For COVID-19 Relief. “Before Trump left office, he put pressure on Congress to approve another COVID-19 stimulus package that includes $2,000 direct payments to Americans. The $900 billion package that Congress approved and Trump signed only included $600 direct payments, and Biden has since pledged to advocate for another round of direct payments. Axne, Iowa’s lone Democratic representative, said Congress needs to approve another stimulus bill because, she said, food banks are overloaded, some people are only working part-time, and some people haven’t applied for unemployment. ‘To me this is a no brainer, and it’s really unfortunate that my colleagues can’t see that people are suffering in our own backyard,’ Axne said. She said passing more relief is a priority this year, and she’s working on allocating $100 million to support broadband capabilities nationwide. She also listed support for schools reopening and the health care industry. Miller-Meeks and Hinson both said they think it’s too soon to start thinking about another round of direct payments when we haven’t seen the full economic effects of the last stimulus package. ‘I don't want to hamper our economic recovery by going too big of a package at the wrong time,’ Miller-Meeks said.” [Daily Iowan, 1/24/21]

Miller-Meeks: “Currently About 40 Percent Of Workers On Enhanced Unemployment Are Paid More Than They Did While They Were Working: Coincidentally There Is A Labor Shortage.” “MILLER-MEEKS: Thank you and currently about 40 percent of workers on enhanced unemployment are paid more than they did while they were working; coincidentally there is a labor shortage. In my home state of Iowa, as of May 2021, 87,000 workers dropped out of the labor force since February 2020, a 5 percent decrease in the size of Iowa’s workforce notwithstanding employers in my state cannot find workers and these are jobs that are greater than $15 an hour; even some employers cannot find people to work at salaries of between $80,000 and $130,000. As Governor Brainard pointed out earlier this year, true unemployment is far higher than the headline rate and the labor force participation rate is nearly 6 percentage points below where it was at the beginning of the 21st century. Shouldn't we be doing everything we can to incentivize work for our citizens and shouldn't we be looking at bringing in additional unskilled workers into this country at a time when we have a labor shortage of skilled workers?” [CQ, 6/22/21]
Miller-Meeks: “We Need To Get Rid Of The Pandemic Emergency Measures That Were Put In Place, And That Were Just Passed In January, That Had Increased Enhanced Federal Unemployment Benefits.” “On the subject of the current labor shortage, Representative Miller-Meeks said. ‘Right now, we are seeing there’s a huge demand for labor. And we can’t get labor and people into the workforce. And I’m not talking about jobs that pay $7.25 an hour; I don’t even know of a job, even if that’s the federal minimum wage, I don’t know of any employer that’s paying that. They’re all paying much more than that. And to get workers at $16 to $20 an hour and even, I’ve talked to some employers, to get people to come in to jobs that are 80 to 130 thousand a year, or they’re having difficulty. So we need to get rid of the pandemic emergency measures that were put in place, and that were just passed in January, that had increased federal unemployment benefits. We need to relinquish that so we can get people back in the workplace.’” [Oskaloosa News, 5/31/21]

Miller-Meeks Supported Iowa Ending Participation In Pandemic UI

Miller-Meeks “Fully Support[ed]” Gov. Reynolds’ Decision To End Iowa’s Participation In Federal Pandemic-Related Unemployment Benefits. “I fully support @IAGovernor's decision. Iowa has been leading the way for months by getting our kids back in school, reopening our businesses, and putting our economy back on track.” QUOTE TWEET @IAGovernor: “Iowa will end its participation in federal pandemic-related unemployment benefit programs. Our unemployment rate is at 3.7 percent, vaccines are available to anyone who wants one, and we have more jobs available than unemployed people. (1/2)” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 5/11/21]

March 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against And Repeatedly Attacked The American Rescue Plan (ARP)

March 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Concurring In The Senate Amendment To The American Rescue Plan Act. In March 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against: “Yarmuth, D-Ky., motion to concur in the Senate amendment to the bill comprising a $1.9 trillion coronavirus relief package to further address the health and economic effects of COVID-19, including approximately $362 billion in direct aid to state and local governments; $47.8 billion for testing and contact tracing; $168 billion to assist educational institutions; and $53.6 billion to assist small businesses. It would extend federal unemployment compensation benefits through Sept. 6, 2021; provide tax rebates of $1,400 for individuals with incomes of $75,000 or less; and extend or expand a number of employer and individual tax credits, including credits to subsidize health insurance premiums. The bill would provide direct assistance of $195.3 billion for states and $130.2 billion for local governments, as well as $10 billion for grants to states to support capital projects, such as broadband access. It would provide $122.8 billion for an Education Department elementary and secondary school emergency relief fund; $39.6 billion for grants to higher education institutions; $3 billion for education programs for individuals with disabilities and $2.75 billion for non-public schools. It would provide $39 billion for child care block grants to states. It would provide $27.8 billion for emergency rental assistance and housing vouchers, $10 billion for homeownership assistance and $5 billion for assistance to individuals experiencing homelessness. It would continue the 15% increase in Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program benefits through September 2021. It would provide over $92 billion for the Health and Human Services Department, including $47.8 billion for COVID-19 testing and contact tracing; $7.5 billion for vaccine administration and distribution; $6.1 billion for vaccine and therapeutic development, manufacturing and procurement; $7.6 billion to expand the public health workforce; $7.6 billion for community health centers; $6.1 billion for Native American health programs; and $3 billion for substance abuse and mental health block grant programs. It would provide $50 billion for the Federal Emergency Management Agency disaster relief fund; $14.5 billion for veterans’ health care services; $10 billion for emergency medical supply production under the Defense Production Act; $8.7 billion for COVID-19 health response efforts overseas; and $200 million for Labor Department worker protection activities, including at least half for the Occupational Safety and Health Administration. It would extend federal unemployment compensation benefits of $300 per week through Sep. 6, 2021. It would provide an additional tax rebate of $1,400 for individuals with incomes of $75,000 or less, increased by $1,400 for each dependent. It would expand eligibility and increase the maximum earned income tax credit for childless adults and increase the child tax credit to $3,000 per child. It would expand and extend through September 2021 paid sick and family leave tax credits for employers. It would require Medicaid and the Children’s Health Insurance Program to fully cover the cost of COVID-19 vaccines. It would provide for full federal subsidies of
individual COBRA premiums and require the VA to waive health treatment copayments through September 2021. It would expand eligibility in 2021 and 2022 for federal tax subsidies toward Affordable Care Act marketplace insurance premiums, including to fully cover premium costs for individuals earning up to 150% of the federal poverty level and cap premiums at 8.5% of household income. It would provide for temporary increases in federal medical assistance percentages for certain services and eliminate the Medicaid drug rebate cap beginning in 2023. It would provide $50 billion for small business assistance, including $28.6 billion for restaurants and $7.25 billion for the Paycheck Protection Program. It would provide $4 billion for Agriculture Department pandemic-related assistance.” The motion was agreed to by a vote of 220-211. [HR 1319, Vote #72, 3/10/21; CQ, 3/10/21]

February 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Passage Of The American Rescue Plan Act. In February 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against: “Passage of the fiscal 2021 budget reconciliation bill, as amended, comprising a coronavirus relief package that would provide roughly $1.9 trillion in funding to further address the health and economic effects of COVID-19, including approximately $350 billion in direct aid to state and local governments; $47.8 billion for testing and contact tracing; $168 billion to assist educational institutions; and $50 billion to assist small businesses. It would extend and increase federal unemployment compensation benefits for 24 weeks and increase the weekly amount to $400; provide tax rebates of $1,400 for individuals with incomes of $75,000 or less; extend or expand a number of employer and individual tax credits, including credits to subsidize health insurance premiums; and gradually increase the federal minimum wage to $15 per hour. Among other provisions, the bill would provide $195.3 billion for direct assistance to states and $130.2 billion for local governments; $128.6 billion through fiscal 2023 for an Education Department elementary and secondary school emergency relief fund and $39.6 billion for grants to higher education institutions, including to provide emergency financial aid; and continue the 15% increase in Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program benefits through September 2021. It would provide $47.8 billion for COVID-19 testing and contact tracing; $7.5 billion for vaccine administration and distribution; and $6.1 billion for vaccine and therapeutic development, manufacturing and procurement. It would require Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program to fully cover the cost of COVID-19 vaccines. It would expand eligibility in 2021 and 2022 for federal tax subsidies toward Affordable Care Act marketplace insurance premiums, including to fully cover premium costs for individuals earning up to 150% of the federal poverty level and cap premiums at 8.5% of household income. It would provide $50 billion for small business assistance, including $25 billion for restaurants. It would provide $30.5 billion for transit, $18 billion for airline and aviation manufacturing industry payroll support; and $4 billion for Agriculture Department pandemic-related assistance. It would incrementally increase the federal minimum wage annually to reach $15 per hour in 2025, including for tipped workers, teens and workers with disabilities. It would create a program to provide financial assistance to multiemployer pension plans.” The bill passed by a vote of 219-212. [HR 1319, Vote #49, 2/27/21; CQ, 2/27/21]

February 2021: Miller-Meeks Said She Voted Against The American Rescue Plan Because Its Provisions Were “Only Tangentially Related To The COVID Pandemic.” “Today, February 27th, 2021, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02) released the following statement after voting NO on H.R. 1319, the budget reconciliation package: ‘I am disappointed that all Republican amendments, including Rep. Feenstra’s bipartisan derecho disaster relief amendment, were blocked from this $1.9 trillion bill. With almost $1 trillion of previous bipartisan funding packages remaining unspent and now over a trillion in new funds only tangentially related to the COVID pandemic; it is unacceptable that less than 1/2 of 1% of the total funds in this bill will go to fund local and state public health workers. Additionally, roughly 9% of the funds are going to vaccines, testing, and contact tracing, which is simply not enough. Across Iowa’s 99 counties, local public health officials are intelligent, experienced, and capable to dispense vaccines in a rapid and efficient process. Acknowledging the tremendous work that our state and local public health workforce does on a daily basis and FUNDING their efforts directly down to the community level with non-competitive local public health grants will go a long way towards defeating this virus and get America back on its feet.”’ [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 2/27/21]

- Miller-Meeks Criticized The American Rescue Plan (ARP), Claiming “Less Than One Half Of 1% Of The Total $1.9 Trillion Funding Went To Public Health Workforce.” “MILLER-MEEKS: “And in fact, I spoke on the floor of Congress in criticism of the latest COVID relief bill that passed because less than one half of 1% of the total $1.9 trillion funding went to public health workforce, and it could have gone to public health workforce and non-competitive grants to local public health workforce, of which in Iowa there are 101 local
public health workforces, county departments who did amazing work during the pandemic.” [YouTube, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 9/30/21] (VIDEO) 00:00:15

The American Rescue Plan Act Provided $1,400 Direct Payments, Aid To State And Local Governments, Schools, And Small Businesses, An Expanded Child Tax Credit, And Vaccine Distribution Funds

The American Rescue Plan Act provided $1,400 direct payments, aid to state and local governments, schools, and small businesses, an expanded child tax credit, and vaccine distribution funds. “President Biden signed the $1.9 trillion American Rescue Plan Act into law on Thursday, finalizing an early policy victory that will send much-needed aid to millions of Americans still struggling from the COVID-19 pandemic. […] The American Rescue Plan provides $1,400 direct payments to individuals making up to $75,000 annually, $350 billion in aid to state and local governments and $14 billion for vaccine distribution. The bill also provides $130 billion to elementary, middle and high schools to assist with safe reopening. […] It includes an additional $300 billion in weekly jobless benefits through September and an expanded tax credit of up to $3,600 per child, initially distributed in monthly installments. The child tax credit could raise 4 million children out of poverty, according to an analysis by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. More than $50 billion will be distributed to small businesses, including $7 billion for the Paycheck Protection Program. The bill also provides $25 billion for relief for small and mid-sized restaurants, which have suffered significantly during the pandemic.” [CBS News, 3/12/21]

Iowans Received $3.9 Billion In Third Round Economic Impact Payments Through ARP

Individuals In Iowa Received $3.9 Billion In Third Round Economic Impact Payments Of Up To $1,400 Through The American Rescue Plan. Iowa received $3.904 billion in Third Round Economic Impact Payments through The American Rescue Plan Act: “The U.S. Department of the Treasury and the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) released state-by-state data through early June for the 163.5 million Economic Impact Payments (EIPs) totaling nearly $390 billion received by individuals through the American Rescue Plan Act. With this round of payments, the IRS and the Bureau of the Fiscal Service (BFS) have delivered more EIPs and more total direct relief than in any previous round of direct relief. All 50 states saw more total relief with this round of payments than in previous rounds. […] The EIPs under the American Rescue Plan included payments of up to $1,400 per qualifying dependent, a significant increase over the $500 and $600 per qualifying child from the first and second rounds of payments, respectively.” [Department of the Treasury, Press Release, 6/29/21]

According To Estimates From The Joint Economic Committee Made Using State-Level Data From The Treasury, Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District Had Received $37.7 Million In Child Tax Credit Payments, And Iowans Received $157 Million Statewide

According to estimates from the Joint Economic Committee, Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District had received $37.7 million in Child Tax Credit payments as of August 2021: “Using state-level data from the Treasury Department on advance Child Tax Credit (CTC) payments, the Joint Economic Committee estimated the number of qualifying children, total number of payments, and total payment amount by congressional district in August 2021, when the second round of CTC payments was distributed.” [Joint Economic Committee, 9/9/21; Joint Economic Committee, Estimates of Advance Child Tax Credit Distribution by Congressional District, 9/9/21]

- JEC Analysis Showed The CTC Had Dramatically Reduced Food Insecurity And Financial Hardship, And Was Expected To Inject Nearly $19.3 Billion Into Local Economies Each Month. “JEC analysis of data from the Census Bureau show the expanded CTC is already having a major impact on family budgets, with dramatic declines in food insufficiency and financial hardship, and the JEC estimates that monthly CTC payments will inject nearly $19.3 billion into local economies each month. The expanded CTC will generate nearly $19.3 billion in spending in local economies across the U.S. each month. Family finances improved significantly following the first monthly expanded CTC payments in July. Data from the Census Bureau show that following the July payments, there were significant declines in the share of households with children...
reporting financial hardship and food insufficiency. Families are using the expanded CTC payments to meet the needs of their household. Among those who responded to the Census Bureau’s survey: 47% spent their CTC payment on food, 28% spent it on internet and other utilities, 26% spent it on school expenses, and 17% of those with at least one child under age 5 spent it on child care.” [Joint Economic Committee, 9/9/21]

As Of August 2021, Iowa Had Received $157 Million In Child Tax Credit Payments As Part Of The American Rescue Plan. As of August 2021, Iowa had received $157 million in Child Tax Credit payments: “The U.S. Department of the Treasury and the Internal Revenue Service announced today that more than $15 billion were paid to families that include roughly 61 million eligible children in the second monthly payment of the expanded and newly-advanceable Child Tax Credit from the American Rescue Plan passed in March. […] Eligible families received a payment of up to $300 per month for each child under age 6 and up to $250 per month for each child age 6 to 17. This tax relief is having a real impact on the lives of America’s children. According to the Census Bureau’s Household Pulse Survey data released earlier this week, parents reported having less trouble covering the costs of food and other household expenses after receiving their first CTC payment. The share of families reporting that they sometimes or often did not have enough to eat in the past week dropped to the lowest percentage since the pandemic began. Parents are using their CTC payments to pay for basics for their kids.” [Department of the Treasury, Press Release, 8/13/21]

- Parents Reported Having Less Trouble Covering The Costs Of Food And Other Household Expenses After Receiving Their First Child Tax Credit Payment. “According to the Census Bureau’s Household Pulse Survey data released earlier this week, parents reported having less trouble covering the costs of food and other household expenses after receiving their first CTC payment. The share of families reporting that they sometimes or often did not have enough to eat in the past week dropped to the lowest percentage since the pandemic began. Parents are using their CTC payments to pay for basics for their kids.” [Department of the Treasury, Press Release, 8/13/21]

Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District Received $31.6 Million In Small Business Support From Restaurant Revitalization Funding Through ARP, And $122 Million Statewide

As Of August 2021, Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District Had Received $31.6 Million In Restaurant Revitalization Funding To Help Restaurants Keep Their Doors Open As Part Of The American Rescue Plan. As of August 2021, Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District had received $31.6 million in Restaurant Revitalization Funding as part of The American Rescue Plan: “The American Rescue Plan Act established the Restaurant Revitalization Fund (RRF) to provide funding to help restaurants and other eligible businesses keep their doors open. This program will provide restaurants with funding equal to their pandemic-related revenue loss up to $10 million per business and no more than $5 million per physical location. Recipients are not required to repay the funding as long as funds are used for eligible uses no later than March 11, 2023.” [U.S. Small Business Administration, RRF FOIA, 8/18/21; U.S. Small Business Administration, accessed 9/7/21]

- As Of June 2021, Iowa Had Received $122 Million In Restaurant Revitalization Funding As Part Of The American Rescue Plan. [U.S. Small Business Administration, RRF Report, 6/30/21]

Iowa Received $91 Million In Small Business Support From Shuttered Venues Operators Grants Through ARP To Help Live Venues, Museums, And Theaters Stay Open

As Of December 2021, Iowa Had Received $91 Million In Shuttered Venues Operators Grants To Help Live Venues, Museums, And Theaters Stay Open As Part Of The American Rescue Plan. As of December 2021, Iowa had received $91 million in Shuttered Venues Operators Grants as part of the American Rescue Plan Act: “The Shuttered Venue Operators Grant (SVOG) program was established by the Economic Aid to Hard-Hit Small Businesses, Nonprofits, and Venues Act, and amended by the American Rescue Plan Act. The program includes over $16 billion in grants to shuttered venues, to be administered by SBA’s Office of Disaster Assistance. Eligible applicants may qualify for grants equal to 45% of their gross earned revenue, with the maximum amount available
for a single grant award of $10 million. $2 billion is reserved for eligible applications with up to 50 full-time employees. [...] Eligible entities include: live venue operators or promoters, theatrical producers, live performing arts organization operators, museum operators, motion picture theater operators (including owners), talent representatives.” [SBA Shuttered Venue Operators Grant Program Reports, 12/27/21; SBA accessed 9/8/21]

Iowa Received $775 Million In Small Business Support From Elementary And Secondary School Emergency Relief Through ARP To Help Safely Reopen Schools

Iowa Received $775 Million In Elementary And Secondary School Emergency Relief Through The American Rescue Plan To Help Safely Reopen Schools. Iowa received $775 million in Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief through the American Rescue Plan: “This document outlines the American Rescue Plan Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ARP ESSER) Fund under the American Rescue Plan (ARP) Act of 2021, Public Law 117-2, enacted on March 11, 2021. ARP ESSER provides a total of nearly $122 billion to States and school districts to help safely reopen and sustain the safe operation of schools and address the impact of the coronavirus pandemic on the nation’s students. In addition to ARP ESSER, the ARP Act includes $3 billion for special education, $850 million for the Outlying Areas, $2.75 billion to support non-public schools, and additional funding for homeless children and youth, Tribal educational agencies, Native Hawaiians, and Alaska Natives.” [ARP ESSER Methodology and Allocation Table Revised, 6/25/21; Department of Education, Fact Sheet, 3/17/21]

Iowa Received $1.48 Billion In Coronavirus State And Local Fiscal Recovery Funds As Part Of The American Rescue Plan To Help Governments Respond To The Pandemic And Bring Back Jobs

Iowa Received $1.48 Billion In Coronavirus State And Local Fiscal Recovery Funds As Part Of The American Rescue Plan To Help Governments Respond To The Pandemic And Bring Back Jobs. Iowa received $1.48 billion in Coronavirus State and Local Fiscal Recovery Funds as part of the American Rescue Plan: “The American Rescue Plan will deliver $350 billion for eligible state, local, territorial, and Tribal governments to respond to the COVID-19 emergency and bring back jobs. [...] Recipients may use these funds to: support public health expenditures, by, for example, funding COVID-19 mitigation efforts, medical expenses, behavioral healthcare, and certain public health and safety staff, address negative economic impacts caused by the public health emergency, including economic harms to workers, households, small businesses, impacted industries, and the public sector, replace lost public sector revenue, using this funding to provide government services to the extent of the reduction in revenue experienced due to the pandemic, provide premium pay for essential workers, offering additional support to those who have and will bear the greatest health risks because of their service in critical infrastructure sectors, invest in water, sewer, and broadband infrastructure, making necessary investments to improve access to clean drinking water, support vital wastewater and stormwater infrastructure, and to expand access to broadband internet, within these overall categories, recipients have broad flexibility to decide how best to use this funding to meet the needs of their communities. [Department of the Treasury, Allocation for States, accessed 9/8/21; Department of the Treasury, accessed 9/8/21]

- The 24 Counties Comprising Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District Received $151.9 Million In Coronavirus State And Local Fiscal Recovery Funds As A Result Of The American Rescue Plan. [Department of the Treasury, May 2021]

Coronavirus State And Local Fiscal Recovery Funds – Law Enforcement

The American Rescue Plan Provided $350 Billion In State And Local Funding To Hire Law Enforcement Officials, Pay Overtime For Community Policing, And Restore Law Enforcement To Pre-Pandemic Levels. “Today, the Treasury Department is highlighting that communities experiencing a surge in gun violence as a result of the pandemic may use the American Rescue Plan’s $350 billion in state and local funding for purposes such as: Hiring law enforcement officials – even above pre-pandemic levels – or paying overtime where the funds are directly focused on advancing community policing strategies in those communities experiencing an increase in gun violence associated with the pandemic. […] In addition, the Treasury Department is clarifying that any community
may use ARP state and local aid for the above strategies and any other public safety programs, up to the level of revenue loss the jurisdiction experienced during the pandemic. And any community may use ARP funds to rehire police officers and other public servants to restore law enforcement and courts to their pre-pandemic levels.” [White House, Press Release, 6/23/21]

**Department Of The Treasury: “There Are Many Ways In Which The State And Local Fiscal Recovery Funds […] Can Support Communities Working To Reduce And Respond To Increased Violence.”** “Under Treasury’s Interim Final Rule, there are many ways in which the State and Local Fiscal Recovery Funds (“Funds”) under the American Rescue Plan Act can support communities working to reduce and respond to increased violence due to the pandemic. […] In all communities, recipients may use resources to rehire police officers and other public servants to restore law enforcement and courts to their pre-pandemic levels. […] In communities where an increase in violence or increased difficulty in accessing or providing services to respond to or mitigate the effects of violence, is a result of the pandemic they may use funds to address that harm. This spending may include: Hiring law enforcement officials – even above pre-pandemic levels – or paying overtime where the funds are directly focused on advancing community policing strategies in those communities experiencing an increase in gun violence associated with the pandemic or Community Violence Intervention (CVI) programs, including capacity building efforts at CVI programs like funding and training additional intervention workers.” [Department of the Treasury, 7/19/21]

**Biden: “The American Rescue Plan, Which We Passed In The First 100 Days Of My Administration, Is Providing Much-Needed, Historic Relief To Bring Back Those Law Enforcement Jobs.”** President Biden: “The American Rescue Plan, which we passed in the first 100 days of my administration, is providing much-needed, historic relief to bring back those law enforcement jobs and social service jobs. Much of this relief has already arrived. The rest is on its way. And we’re now providing more guidance on how they can use the $350 billion nationally that the American Rescue Plan has available to help reduce crime and address the root causes. For example, cities experiencing an increase in gun violence were able to use the American Rescue Plan dollars to hire police officers needed for community policing and to pay their overtime. Mayors will also be able to buy crime-fighting technologies, like gunshot detection systems, to better see and stop gun violence in their communities. They can use the funding to scale up wraparound services for the residents as well, including substance abuse and mental health services that we know will make a difference in prevention of crime.” [White House, 6/23/21]

**Miller-Meeks Opposed The COVID-19 Eviction Moratorium**

Miller-Meeks Called The Eviction Moratorium “Unconstitutional” And Said It Was “Unfairly Harming Mom & Pop Property Owners.” “Props on your coverage of this horrendous execution. Meanwhile, POTUS extends an unconstitutional eviction moratorium unfairly harming mom & pop property owners who have problems paying mortgage, property taxes and upkeep.” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 8/14/21]

Miller-Meeks Said The Eviction Moratorium Hurts Small Businesses, Local Community Banks, And Renters Who “Can’t Pay Their Property Taxes Because They’ve Got No Income.” “So remember that it was the moderate Democrats who kept the progressives from being able to have an extension of the eviction moratorium. Maxine Waters and other progressive Democrats were really pushing for that issue but as we know that’s an issue that hurts mom-and-pops, it hurts our local community banks, it hurts our tax base, when the person who as a landowner, property owner, who rents out just a simple property can’t pay their property taxes because they’ve got no income.” [FOX Business, 8/21/21] (VIDEO) 00:00:42-00:01:12

**Miller-Meeks Said She Supported The Paycheck Protection Program**

October 2020: Miller-Meeks Said Another COVID-19 Economic Relief Bill Should Facilitate SNAP Benefits, Additional PPP Funds, And Address Unemployment. “As the debate largely centered on the pandemic, the two agreed that Congress should take swift action to reach bipartisan solutions. Negotiations on more government aid have stalled in Congress as President Donald Trump waffles on pressing the legislative branch to pass a relief
package. Trump had tweeted Tuesday that he ‘instructed my representatives to stop negotiating until after the election,’ though hours later, he urged Congress to pass a new relief bill. […] Miller-Meeks agreed that the hiatus in negotiations over another relief package was ‘disappointing,’ especially seeing firsthand the struggling individuals and small businesses in her town. Another bill should provide additional Paycheck Protection Program funds, address unemployment and facilitate Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program benefits - popularly known as food stamps - to help those with food insecurity, Miller-Meeks said. She touted Iowa's 'conservative fiscal practices’ as helping the state better brace for the pandemic than other states, taking aim at three states under Democratic control. ‘You can't expect the taxpayers of Iowa to bailout Illinois or New York or California for their poor fiscal practices,’ Miller-Meeks said.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 10/8/20]

March 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted For Extending The Authorization For The Small Business Administration’s PPP Loan Program Through June 2021. In March 2021, Miller-Meeks voted for: “Velazquez, D-N.Y., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill that would extend the authorization for the Small Business Administration's Paycheck Protection Program from March 31 to June 30, 2021. It would prohibit the SBA from accepting new PPP loan applications after May 31, 2021.” The motion was agreed to by a vote of 415-3. [HR 1799, Vote #80, 3/16/21; CQ, 3/16/21]

April 2020: Miller-Meeks Said She Supported The Paycheck Protection Plan And Wanted To Expand The Program For Small Businesses. At a Johnson County GOP Candidate Forum Miller-Meeks was said “So I think the payroll protection plan or the PPP needs to be expanded so that smaller businesses have more access to that funding. It’s a forgivable loan if it’s used to pay for rent or for employees in order to maintain them as employees to maintain their staff. [Johnson County GOP Candidate Forum, 00:07:34, 4/24/20] (VIDEO)

Masks

2020: Miller-Meeks Refused To Wear A Mask On The Iowa Senate Floor, Citing Blatantly False Claim That COVID Was “Not Aerosolized” To Argue Going Without A Mask Was Safe

June 2020: Miller-Meeks Refused To Wear A Mask On The Floor Of The Iowa Senate, Arguing That She Did Not Need To Wear A Mask If She Stood Six Feet Away From Her Colleagues. “Despite Miller-Meeks’ votes and statements showing otherwise, her latest ad says she ‘took COVID seriously.’ In June, when called out on the Senate floor by Sen. Bill Dotzler for not wearing a mask, Miller-Meeks argued she did not need to wear a mask so long as she stayed six feet apart from her colleagues. ‘Scientifically, COVID-19 … is not aerosolized, so that’s why you can have a physical separation of six feet,’ Miller-Meeks said. Airborne transmission of the coronavirus, however, has been noted throughout the pandemic as one of the primary ways the virus is spread. ‘The scientific community has been raising the alarm about this since February, that airborne spread can happen,’ Joseph Allen, a professor at the Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, told NBC News.” [Iowa Starting Line, 9/23/20]

Miller-Meeks Falsely Claimed “Scientifically, COVID-19… Is Not Aerosolized.” In Explaining Why She Did Not Need To Wear A Mask. “Despite Miller-Meeks’ votes and statements showing otherwise, her latest ad says she ‘took COVID seriously.’ In June, when called out on the Senate floor by Sen. Bill Dotzler for not wearing a mask, Miller-Meeks argued she did not need to wear a mask so long as she stayed six feet apart from her colleagues. ‘Scientifically, COVID-19 … is not aerosolized, so that’s why you can have a physical separation of six feet,’ Miller-Meeks said. Airborne transmission of the coronavirus, however, has been noted throughout the pandemic as one of the primary ways the virus is spread. ‘The scientific community has been raising the alarm about this since February, that airborne spread can happen,’ Joseph Allen, a professor at the Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, told NBC News.” [Iowa Starting Line, 9/23/20]

2021: Miller-Meeks Was Fined $500 For Twice Violating COVID Protocols By Not Wearing A Mask On The House Floor

May 2021: Miller-Meeks Was One Of Three House Members Fined $500 By the House Ethics Committee
For A Second Violation Of The House Floor Mask Mandate. “As the House finished voting on Tuesday afternoon, a group of Republicans gathered on the floor, smiled and huddled for a selfie. None wore masks. They were among about a dozen Republican lawmakers who openly defied last week’s decision by House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) to keep a mask mandate on the House floor until all lawmakers and staff are vaccinated. Now three of those GOP lawmakers — Brian Mast (Fla.), Mariannette Miller-Meeks (Iowa), a physician, and Beth Van Duyne (Tex.) — face $500 fines for breaking the rules, a Capitol official told The Washington Post. All three were fined because this was the second time they defied the mask mandate, while seven other Republicans were issued a first warning.” [Washington Post, 5/19/21]

- **Miller-Meeks On House Floor Mask Mandate: “Nancy Pelosi Wants To Fine The Science Not Follow The Science.”** “Several GOP lawmakers are risking steep penalties to go mask-less on the House floor. Congresswoman Mariannette Miller-Meeks got hit with a $500 fine for not wearing her mask on the House floor this week. ‘Nancy Pelosi wants to fine the science not follow the science,’ Rep. Miller-Meeks (R-IA) said She says she's fully vaccinated and thinks the House rules miss the opportunity to highlight what the CDC said are the benefits of vaccination. ‘To show Americans that if you were vaccinated you can go without your mask,’ she said.” [WLS 6, 5/21/21]

- **Miller-Meeks Was One Of Eight Republican Members Who Refused To Wear A Mask That Day; Others Included Marjorie Taylor Greene, Lauren Boebert, Louie Gohmert, And Thomas Massie.** “A Capitol official told USA TODAY that three Republicans will be issued $500 fines for defying the mask rules: Reps. Brian Mast of Florida, Beth Van Duyne of Texas, and Mariannette Miller-Meeks of Iowa. Seven other Republicans will be issued warnings: Thomas Massie of Kentucky, Lauren Boebert of Colorado, Marjorie Taylor Greene of Georgia, Chip Roy of Texas, Bob Good of Virginia, Mary Miller of Illinois, and Louie Gohmert of Texas.” [USA Today, 5/19/21]

June 2021: The House Ethics Committee Upheld Its Fines Issued To Republicans Who Violated The House Floor Mask Mandate, Including Miller-Meeks. The House Ethics Committee announced Friday that it is upholding the $500 fines issued to a handful of GOP lawmakers who refused to comply with a requirement last month to wear masks on the House floor during the COVID-19 pandemic. Reps. Brian Mast (Fla.), Beth Van Duyne (Texas) and Mariannette Miller-Meeks (Iowa) were among at least six House Republicans who joined in a protest last month against the requirement that everyone wear masks in the House chamber regardless of vaccination status. [The Hill, 6/25/21]

- **HEADLINE: “House Ethics Panel Upholds $500 Mask Fines Against GOP Lawmakers.”** [The Hill, 6/25/21]

Miller-Meeks Raised Campaign Money Off Her Fine For Not Wearing A Mask

Miller-Meeks Tweeted A Fundraising Link About Being Fined For Violating The House Floor Mask Mandate.
As Of January 2022, Miller-Meeks’ Mask Fines Totaled $2,500

As Of January 2022, Miller-Meeks Had Been Fined $2,500 For Not Wearing A Mask On The House Floor. “Rep. Andrew Clyde (R-Ga.) has been fined at least $58,000 for repeatedly violating rules requiring lawmakers to wear masks on the House floor during the COVID-19 pandemic, while Rep. Lauren Boebert (R-Colo.) has been fined $500, the House Ethics Committee revealed Monday. The Ethics Committee further disclosed that a third Republican, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (Iowa), was also fined for not wearing a mask. […] Miller-Meeks was previously fined $500 in May for refusing to wear a mask as part of a protest among several GOP lawmakers who questioned why the House mask mandate was still in effect when the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) was advising at the time that vaccinated people didn’t need to wear them. The CDC has since rescinded that guidance following new variants that have caused breakthrough infections in vaccinated people. That means Miller-Meeks is now on the hook for a $2,500 fine, which she did not appeal.” [The Hill, 1/10/22]

2021: Miller-Meeks Refused To Speak To A Reporter At A Fundraiser Unless He Removed His Mask

Miller-Meeks Refused To Speak To A Reporter At A County Fundraiser Unless He Removed His Mask. “Political reporter Zachary Oren Smith was covering a Johnson County Republican fundraiser for the Iowa City Press-Citizen on May 5. The event brought out prominent GOP politicians from around southeast Iowa and featured former acting U.S. Attorney General Matt Whitaker, a possible future candidate for U.S. Senate. Oren Smith tweeted that he tried to ask Miller-Meeks some questions near the end of the evening, but was unsuccessful. As a doctor, Miller-Meeks should be aware that a vaccinated person may have many reasons to continue wearing a mask. She can’t be certain Oren Smith isn’t immunocompromised and doesn’t regularly interact with an immunocompromised person. Given recent polling on vaccine hesitancy among Iowa Republicans, there were probably quite a few unvaccinated people at the Johnson County GOP event.” [Bleeding Heartland, 5/6/21]

- Reporter Zachary Oren Smith: Miller-Meeks “Explained She Wouldn’t Talk To Me Unless I Took My Mask Off As We Were Both Vaccinated.” “Some color: I've been trying to get Miller-Meeks in to update Iowa City readers on work in DC for some time. Bumped into her at the end of the night, and she explained she wouldn't talk to me unless I took my mask off as we were both vaccinated. Didn't get my interview.” [Twitter, @ZacharyOS, 5/5/21]
• HEADLINE: “Mariannette Miller-Meeks Refuses Interview With Masked Reporter.” [Bleeding Heartland, 5/6/21]

| Miller-Meeks Opposed Federal Mask Mandates |

Miller-Meeks: “Don’t Force Mask Mandates On Everyone Who Is Vaccinated. That Makes Absolutely No Sense.” “Dr. Miller-Meeks had this to say, ‘I am very concerned about what the CDC is doing now. I think that this guidance, number one, the guidance was slow to begin with as far as removing masks, if you were fully vaccinated, I firmly believe that the vaccines work, that they’re effective, I believe the science behind the vaccine. And so if your double vaccinated, leave that to individuals to determine, given their personal health history and their personal medical risk, to wear a mask if they’re concerned or anxious about catching the Delta variant or the lambda variant that is coming up from South America. But don’t force mask mandates on everyone who is vaccinated. That makes absolutely no sense. And I’ve yet to see that data. So if I have the opportunity and I think I will speak with members of the Doc caucus to send a letter to Dr. Walensky at the CDC asking for the research and the studies that in fact support going and recommending masks on people that are double vaccinated.’” [Fox News Radio, 7/28/21] (AUDIO)

Miller-Meeks Said She Opposed A Federal Mask Mandate But Said “I Think That Role-Modeling, That Guidance Needed To Be More Clear.” “Turning to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, Miller-Meeks said she opposes a federal mask mandate. ‘But I certainly think our communication with individuals, that wearing a mask can help protect other people and can help protect you,’ she said. ‘I think that role-modeling, that guidance needed to be more clear. And early in the pandemic, there was confusion. ... Nonetheless, that guidance needed to be more clear, more emphasized and supported.’” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 9/25/20]

• October 2020: Cedar Rapids Gazette: Miller-Meeks “Had Doubts About How To Enforce A Mandate And Whether To Fine Or Arrest Individuals Not Wearing Masks.” “On the issue of whether a mask mandate is needed, Miller-Meeks said she practices social distancing, wears a mask in public and sanitizes her hands - though she thinks others shouldn't be forced to do the same. 'I think those simple things all of us can do to make it better for everyone else,’ she said, but she had doubts about how to enforce a mandate and whether to fine or arrest individuals not wearing masks.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 10/8/20]

| Vaccines |

| Miller-Meeks Consistently Opposed Vaccine Mandates |

Miller-Meeks Opposed The Biden Administration’s Proposed Vaccine Mandate And Sponsored Legislation To Undermine It

Miller-Meeks: OSHA’s Announcement That It Was Suspending Its Vaccine Mandate Was “Great News.” ‘Eastern Iowa Republican Reps. Ashley Hinson and Mariannette Miller-Meeks joined more than 150 fellow GOP U.S. House members in filing legislation Wednesday to nullify the vaccine-or-mask mandate by the Democratic president. Both are vaccinated and encourage others to vaccinate, however they see the mandate as an overreach of presidential authority. The Occupational Safety and Health Administration announced on its website Wednesday it was complying with a federal court’s order to ‘take no steps to implement or enforce’ Biden’s order. That was ‘great news’ to Miller-Meeks, a fully vaccinated Ottumwa physician who has administered vaccines in all 24 counties in southeast Iowa's 2nd District and previously served as director of the Iowa Department of Public Health. ‘I have been calling for this mandate to be stopped since it was introduced, and I was proud to help introduce a resolution to block it from going into effect earlier today,’ Miller-Meeks said.’ [Quad-City Times, 11/17/21]

Miller-Meeks: The OSHA Vaccine Mandate Was “Another Step Toward Dictating The Medical Choices Of Private Citizens” And Would “Harm Small Businesses And Exacerbate The Current Labor And Supply
Chain Crises.” ‘On Thursday, the Biden Administration took another step toward dictating the medical choices of private citizens. The November 4th ruling by the Department of Labor’s Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) requiring certain employers to develop mandatory vaccination policies will harm small businesses and exacerbate the current labor and supply chain crises. The mandate would force businesses with 100 or more employees to require employees to be vaccinated or submit to weekly testing and wear a face-covering in the workplace. The rule, which will affect more than 80 million Americans, imposes $14,000 fines on employers for each violation. Along with the Administration’s policies paying Americans to not work, this rule will have a negative impact on the current labor shortage.’ [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Blog Post, 11/5/21]

Miller-Meeks Co-Introduced A Bill To Exempt Essential Workers From The OSHA COVID-19 Vaccine Mandate. ‘Today November 4th, 2021, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02) joined over a dozen House members, led by Rep. Tim Burchett (TN-02), in introducing the Keeping Our COVID-19 Heroes Employed Act. This legislation would protect any individual who was deemed as essential during the COVID-19 pandemic from termination under the Biden Administration’s vaccine mandate. This includes Americans employed by the federal government, private entities that receive federal funds, and private entities that received funding from any of the six coronavirus response bills passed by Congress. It also would exempt public and private federal contractors from the mandate.’ [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 11/4/21]

Miller-Meeks Joined A Letter Urging Biden And The Director Of The Centers For Medicare And Medicaid Services Not To Mandate The COVID-19 Vaccine For Health Care Workers. ‘The GOP Doctors Caucus sent a pair of letters to President Biden and the director of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) warning a vaccine mandate for healthcare workers could worsen patient care and healthcare labor shortages. […] ‘Therefore, we urge CMS not to mandate a COVID-19 vaccine for health care facility employees,’ they continued. ‘If you do, we strongly urge you to exempt employees who can provide proof of natural immunity and to consider allowing unvaccinated individuals to continue their employment subject to routine COVID-19 testing.’ […] Joining Harris on the letter are several prominent healthcare providers in Congress, including Republican Reps. Brad Wenstrup of Ohio, Mariannette Miller-Meeks of Iowa, and Michael Burgess of Texas.’ [Fox News, 10/25/21]

October 2021: Miller-Meeks Cosponsored A Bill Opposing Biden’s Vaccine Mandate And Requiring Federal Agencies To Issue A Report About Employees Who Quit Because Of The Mandate. ‘Today, Representative Ronny Jackson, M.D. (TX-13) introduced the Forbidding Repressive Executive Efforts and Denouncing Overreaching Mandates (FREEDOM) Act, which opposes Joe Biden’s authoritarian vaccine mandate. It also requires all federal agencies and departments to issue a report on the number of employees who have quit or will quit because of the mandate, and to estimate the cost and time associated with filling those positions. […] Original co-sponsors of the FREEDOM Act include Representatives Michael Burgess (TX-26), Brian Babin (TX-36), and Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02), all fellow members of the Doctors Caucus.’ [Office Of Rep. Ronny Jackson, Press Release, 10/15/21]


Miller-Meeks: Vaccine Mandates For Health Care Workers Were “Hypocritical” Because They Had Been “Fighting This Virus For 18 Months And Have The Wherewithal And Knowledge To Understand And Make An Informed Decision.” MILLER-MEEKS: ‘How we have responded to reopening our economy and getting back to normal is also troublesome to me and presents a challenge for the healthcare sector specifically. Dr. McKinney, Dr. Roberts, and Dr. Kanter, all three of you mentioned in your written testimony issues with turnover and the struggle to recruit and retain health care workers. Meanwhile, we see an administration pushing for vaccine
mandates among these very populations. These are the brave men and women who worked tirelessly, and many of you in your local departments have worked tirelessly, over a year through the pandemic with no vaccine to care for our country. This seems a little bit hypocritical to me that these health care professionals receive a vaccine after fighting this virus for 18 months and have the wherewithal and knowledge to understand and make an informed decision.’ [YouTube, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 9/29/21] (VIDEO) 00:02:04

Miller-Meeks Said She Was “Deeply Opposed To Federal Mandate Requiring Americans To Receive COVID-19 Vaccines.” ‘Deeply opposed to federal mandate requiring Americans to receive COVID-19 vaccines. I gave COVID-19 vaccines in #IA02 & encourage adult vaccination & speaking with doctor with concerns. Natural immunity effective & respect choice. Our job to transparently show benefits & risks.’ [Twitter, @RepMMM, 9/9/21]

Miller-Meeks Claimed Vaccine Mandates Would Exacerbate Labor Shortages

Miller-Meeks Said Vaccine Or Testing Mandates Would Hurt Businesses And Exacerbate Hiring Problems. ‘Miller-Meeks also criticized Biden's mandate that employers with 100 or more workers ensure their workforce is entirely vaccinated or face weekly COVID-19 testing. The representative and former ophthalmologist has pushed for people to get vaccinated and even administered doses to constituents in 24 counties herself, but she said mandating vaccines would hurt businesses and exacerbate the effects of the labor shortage being experienced by many businesses.’ [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 9/20/21]

Miller-Meeks Said Mandating Vaccines Would Exacerbate The Labor Shortage Being Faced By Many Businesses. ‘Miller-Meeks also criticized Biden's mandate that employers with 100 or more workers ensure their workforce is entirely vaccinated or face weekly COVID-19 testing. The representative and former ophthalmologist has pushed for people to get vaccinated and even administered doses to constituents in 24 counties herself, but she said mandating vaccines would hurt businesses and exacerbate the effects of the labor shortage being experienced by many businesses. ‘I talk to people about the vaccine. I try to persuade them to get the vaccine. But I still believe there should not be a mandate and that we should recognize natural immunity,’ she said.’ [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 9/18/21]

Miller-Meeks Objected To Vaccine Mandates, Preferring To Leave The Decision To Get Vaccinated Up To Individuals

Miller-Meeks Said People Should Be Able to Make Decisions On COVID-19 Vaccination Based On “The Appropriate Information” Rather Than FDA Or CDC Guidance. MILLER-MEEKS: “But we need appropriate information, we need appropriate messaging and we need to allow people to make decisions based on the appropriate information. We can protect one another, but we can also have the freedom to make decisions based on the information that we have rather than the guidance we’ve got from CDC, the FDA which has been you know variable information and I think you’re right. [Fox Business, 8/21/21] (VIDEO) 00:05:27

Miller-Meeks Said She Objected To Vaccine Mandates Because The Vaccine “Is An Injectable Substance.” ‘I'm not for vaccine mandates. And the reason is that this is an injectable substance. It's a medicine that we are putting into people's bodies. I think if you can be honest and forthright with people let them know to check with their doctor if they have concerns. Try to get information, you know, clear guidance and information from the CDC would be tremendously helpful. And that includes adverse reactions and includes risks, which we still don't have a good risk-benefit analysis from the CDC regarding the vaccines, but overall highly effective, very safe, decades of research went into the making of these vaccines even if the vaccine came to the public very rapidly.’ [Miller-Meeks, CNN Newsroom With Pamela Brown, 7/25/21] (VIDEO) 00:03:50

July 2021: Miller-Meeks Wrote An Op-Ed On Vaccine Hesitancy, Saying ‘The Choice To Get Vaccinated Is Personal, But The Consequences Are National.’ ‘The choice to get vaccinated is personal, but the consequences are national. Continued vaccine hesitancy threatens to reverse the progress we have made, particularly as more contagious and severe variants like the delta variant emerge.’ [USA Today, Rep. Miller-Meeks and Bill Foster Op-
October 2020: Cedar Rapids Gazette: “When A Vaccine For COVID-19 Eventually Is Distributed, Miller-Meeks Said She Would Get It But That It Should Not Be Mandatory.” “Asked where she breaks from Trump, Miller-Meeks said she thinks the White House’s event for Trump’s nomination of Amy Coney Barrett to the Supreme Court ‘could’ve been handled differently’ with appropriate social distancing, physical separation and mask wearing. When a vaccine for COVID-19 eventually is distributed, Miller-Meeks said she would get it but that it should not be mandatory.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 10/8/20]

Miller-Meeks Said She Did Not Think The Government In A Pandemic “Should Force You To Have A Vaccine.” “We certainly do need to have more testing and more serological testing and I would love to get serological testing. I don’t think the government in a pandemic such as this I do not think the government should force you to have a vaccine. Now there are other things the government may do, but I do not think they should force you to be tested nor should they force you to be treated. Although right now there’s really not much in the way of treatment excepting treating if you have a fever unless you develop such severe respiratory complications that you have to be hospitalized. So there’s not much in the way of treatment at this point in time.” [Lee County GOP Candidate Forum, 00:52:04, 5/12/20] (VIDEO)

Pre-Election In 2020, Miller-Meeks Said She Supported Vaccine Mandates In Schools, Though She Opposed A National Vaccine Mandate

November 2020: Miller-Meeks Said She Did Not Support A National Vaccine Mandate, But Did Favor Requiring Children To Be Vaccinated In Order To Attend School. “Miller-Meeks said she is confident the United States will have a COVID-19 vaccine by the end of the year, and that it will be safe and effective. But said she does not support a national vaccine mandate, but favors requiring children receive the vaccine to attend school, citing similar existing laws that require immunization against childhood diseases.” [Quad-City Times, 11/3/20]

Miller-Meeks Opposed Waiving Pharma Companies’ Intellectual Property Rights To Encourage Global Vaccine Distribution

June 2021: Miller-Meeks Sponsored A Resolution Expressing That The United States Should Not Waive Intellectual Property Protections For COVID-19 Vaccines. On June 17, 2021, Miller-Meeks sponsored H Res. 484, which “expresses the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should not waive intellectual property protections for COVID-19 vaccines, treatments, or other related innovations.” The resolution was read twice and referred to the House Judiciary Committee. [H Res. 484, Sponsored, 6/17/21; CQ, 6/17/21]

Miller-Meeks Introduced A Resolution To “Express The Sense Of The House Of Representatives That The U.S. Should Not Waive IP Rights Relating To COVID-19 Vaccines Or Treatments.” “Today, June 17th, 2021, Reps. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02) and Michelle Fischbach (MN-07) introduced a resolution to protect the intellectual property (IP) of COVID-19 vaccines. This resolution would express the sense of the House of Representatives that the U.S. should not waive IP rights relating to COVID-19 vaccines or treatments. ‘Waiving the IP for the COVID-19 vaccine would destroy billions of dollars in U.S. IP by handing it over to countries like Russia and China. Giving away our IP will also set a precedent for future pandemics and deter pharmaceutical investment,’ said Miller-Meeks. ‘If we have learned anything from the COVID-19 pandemic, it is that we now understand the importance of having our private sector partners working with us to prepare for future emergencies. As a doctor and member of both the Homeland Security Committee and Select Subcommittee on the Coronavirus Crisis, I understand the importance of protecting our IP to support our healthcare system and bolster our domestic supply chains.’” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 6/17/21]

Miller-Meeks Quote-Tweeted An Editorial That Claimed The Goal Of The Vaccine Patent Waiver Was To Erode Pharmaceutical Intellectual Property Rights. “Forget cures for cancer, Alzheimer’s or uncommon autoimmune diseases. QUOTE TWEET: @WSJopinion: Sen. Elizabeth Warren admits the goal of the vaccine
patent waiver is to set a precedent that erodes all drug intellectual property protections.” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 5/16/21]

**Miller-Meeks Boasted Of Personally Traveling Her District To Administer COVID-19 Vaccines**

Miller-Meeks Said She Personally Was Vaccinated Against COVID-19 And Gave COVID-19 Vaccines To Others. “MARIANNETTE MILLER-MEEKS: Thank you so much, Mr. Chair and I think all of our panelists. And you know, unfortunately I was not going to start my questions this way, but I just want to clarify some things from my colleagues. First of all, I am a proponent of COVID-19 vaccines. I've been vaccinated. I gave vaccines and attended vaccine clinics and all 24 of my counties. Early on in the pandemic and when we first have vaccines available, there was not as much research and data we have available about natural immunity as there is now. So if I may say, being a proponent of acknowledging the benefit of natural immunity, which does not mean people should go to COVID-19 parties and get infected, but to recognize that immunity is what we should be talking about, whether it is immunity from a vaccine or immunity from natural disease, and then that way have vaccines available for those who need vaccines, and also to treat and send to other nations so that their population can have an increased level of immunity so we can get through the global pandemic.” [CQ, 9/22/21]

July 2021: Miller-Meeks Said, “I Have Been To Every County In My District, All 24 Counties In Southeast Iowa, To Administer The COVID-19 Vaccines.” “I have been to every county in my district, all 24 counties in Southeast Iowa, to administer the COVID-19 vaccines. I also attended a function on getting young people to run for office and administered vaccines there when a pharmacist brought the vaccine. I've also penned an op ed on this topic with my colleague, Representative Foster, as he indicated, which was published today in USA Today on this exact topic. And I've done multiple interviews, and sent letters encouraging the American people to get vaccinated.” [CQ, 7/1/21]

**Miller-Meeks Accused Biden Of Having “Botched” The COVID-19 Vaccine Roll-Out**

Miller-Meeks Said The Second Dose Of The COVID-19 Vaccines ‘Should Have Been Delayed And Those With Infection Acquired Natural Immunity Could Have Avoided Vaccination Until Humoral & T Cells AB’s Waned.’ ‘Despite this administration having 3 effective vaccines: botched roll-out, 2nd dose should have been delayed and those with infection acquired natural immunity could have avoided vaccination until humoral & T cells AB’s waned’ [Twitter, @millermeeks, 10/8/21]

Miller-Meeks Said The Biden Administration ‘Botched’ The COVID-19 Vaccine Rollout. ‘Despite this administration having 3 effective vaccines: botched roll-out, 2nd dose should have been delayed and those with infection acquired natural immunity could have avoided vaccination until humoral & T cells AB’s waned’ [Twitter, @millermeeks, 10/8/21]

April 2021: Miller-Meeks Asked Dr. Fauci And CDC Director Rochelle Walensky Whether They Would Support Stalling Second Doses Of Pfizer And Moderna Vaccines To Allow More People To Get Their First Doses. ‘During a Thursday (April 15) House coronavirus subcommittee hearing, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (R-IA) asked Kessler, Fauci, and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Director Rochelle Walensky whether, in light of the J&J pause, they would support using RWE as a basis for increasing the duration between the first and second dose of Pfizer's and Moderna's vaccines. She specifically pointed to data from the UK, which in January decided to allow the second dose of the Pfizer vaccine to be administered as many as 12 weeks after the first dose so that more people could be vaccinated with their first dose rather than giving a smaller number of people both doses. Miller-Meeks asked the health officials to answer with a ‘yes’ or a ‘no,’ but Kessler said it's more complicated than a ‘yes-or-no’ answer. Fauci and Walensky followed suit, simply saying it's a complicated issue.’ [Inside Health Policy, 4/19/21]

- April 2021: FDA And CDC Officials Had Urged Providers To Stick To The FDA-Authorized Dosing Schedule For The Pfizer And Moderna COVID-19 Vaccines. ‘Federal health officials from FDA and the
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention have urged providers and patients to stick to the FDA-authorized dosing regimens for Pfizer's and Moderna's two-dose vaccines -- three weeks and four weeks between doses, respectively. There aren't enough data about the efficacy of waiting longer between doses, officials say. Additionally, studies have shown that postponing the second dose left some people less protected against SARS-CoV-2 variants. [Inside Health Policy, 4/19/21]

**April 2021:** The Center For Infectious Disease Research And Policy Had Called For The FDA To Amend The Dosing Schedule For Two-Dose COVID-19 Vaccines To Accommodate Concerns About Vaccine Supply. ‘But some experts worry that the current U.S. vaccine supply might not be resilient enough ensure everyone can get vaccinated with the full two-dose regimen, at least not right away. Concerns about supply have ramped up since the United States paused the use of Johnson & Johnson's one-shot vaccine. All 50 states and several retail pharmacies, following recommendations from FDA and CDC, halted use of J&J's product in light of reports of severe but rare blood clots linked to use of the vaccine. […] The Center for Infectious Disease Research and Policy also has called for FDA to amend Pfizer's and Moderna's vaccine EUAs to allow for the second doses to be deferred to let more people get vaccinated with the first dose.’ [Inside Health Policy, 4/19/21]

**March 2021:** The GOP Doctors Caucus, Which Included Miller-Meeks, Sent A Letter To HHS And The FDA Asking The Agencies To Consider New Data On Delaying Second COVID-19 Vaccine Doses. ‘Miller-Meeks is a member of the GOP Doctors Caucus, which in early March sent a letter asking HHS and FDA to consider new scientific data, including RWE, and use their authority to increase the length of time between the first and second doses of Pfizer's and Moderna's vaccines. HHS, working in tandem with Pfizer and Moderna, should help collect RWE and post-authorization vaccine safety data and consider revising the EUAs as soon as possible, the Doctors Caucus wrote. On March 7, days after sending the letter to HHS, members of the caucus, including Miller-Meeks, wrote an op-ed for Stat in which they asserted that ‘mountains of real-world evidence,’ much of which has come out of Israel and the UK, show that Pfizer's and Moderna's vaccines provide substantial protection against COVID-19 even after only one dose.’ [Inside Health Policy, 4/19/21]

**The GOP Doctors Caucus Letter Asserted That Doses Of The Vaccine Intended To Be Second Doses Could Be Administered To People Who Had Not Had Any Previous COVID-19 Vaccine To Remedy Supply Issues.** ‘In their op-ed, Miller-Meeks and Doctors Caucus Vice Chair Greg Murphy (R-NC) and Rep. Andy Harris (R-MD) asserted the second doses currently being administered to comply with the EUAs could instead be used as initial first doses. Doing so, they added, would essentially double the country's vaccine supply. ‘Considering that nearly every state is facing shortfalls in the supply of Covid-19 vaccines, we believe this groundbreaking development can help remedy some of the vaccine supply issues the nation is facing,’ the op-ed says.’ [Inside Health Policy, 4/19/21]

**Miller-Meeks Warned There Was A “Risk Of Myocarditis With The Vaccine”**

Miller-Meeks said there was a risk of myocarditis with the vaccine. 'People are concerned, young people are concerned, because of the risk of myocarditis with the vaccine. Yes, there’s a risk from COVID-19, but there’s also a risk from the vaccine, and we need better information from the CDC.' [Fox Business, 8/21/21] (VIDEO) 00:05:48

**Miller-Meeks Said Unvaccinated People Were Not A Risk To Others**

November 2021: Miller-Meeks said that the ‘pitting of vaccinated people against unvaccinated people’ was ‘very disturbing.’ ‘I've encouraged people to be vaccinated. I have helped assist them. I've answered questions, and one of the things that I have found very disturbing over the course, and especially when President Biden said he would institute a vaccine mandate, has been this division and pitting of vaccinated people against unvaccinated people. And even recently, the CDC said that they have no data or information on people having had
infection-acquired immunity or natural immunity having been hospitalized for COVID-19 or they have record of those deaths.’ [CQ, 11/16/21]

**Miller-Meeks: ‘If You're Vaccinated, What Do You Have To Fear From Somebody Else Who Is Asymptomatic And Unvaccinated?’** MILLER-MEEKS: ‘But now we're saying you can no longer protect yourself and others that way. If you're vaccinated, what do you have to fear from somebody else who is asymptomatic and unvaccinated? If you're vaccinated, you are protected. If we're not vaccinated, we're at a danger? You're not at a danger to anyone.’ [YouTube, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 11/5/21] (VIDEO) 00:02:47

**Miller-Meeks Said Unvaccinated Individuals Were ‘Not At A Danger To Anyone.’** MILLER-MEEKS: ‘But now we're saying you can no longer protect yourself and others that way. If you're vaccinated, what do you have to fear from somebody else who is asymptomatic and unvaccinated? If you're vaccinated, you are protected. If we're not vaccinated, we're at a danger? You're not at a danger to anyone.’ [YouTube, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 11/5/21] (VIDEO) 00:02:47

**Miller-Meeks Said She Disagreed With Denying Organ Transplants To Unvaccinated Individuals Because They Could Do The ‘Same Mitigation Strategies As Before [The] Vaccine [Was] Available.’** ‘Can’t immunocompromised (after transplant) people do same mitigation strategies as before vaccine available? If test negative, puts no one at risk. Even though I’ve administered vaccines in all 24 counties in my district and am vaccinated, I disagree with withholding care.’ QUOTE TWEET @KCCINews: ‘Colorado woman who won't get vaccinated denied kidney transplant’ [Twitter, @millermeeks, 10/7/21]

**Schools**

**April 2020: Miller-Meeks Said COVID-19 Helped Control The Costs Of Education By Having All Classes Online**

**Miller-Meeks Said COVID-19 Helped Control The Costs Of Education By Having All Classes Online.** At a Johnson County GOP Candidate Forum Miller-Meeks, when asked for ways to control cost of higher education, said “Well I think one of the things that can control the cost of higher education is what we just seen happen through COVID-19 in the pandemic. And that is classes were cancelled for many people and they were done online. So having online education, having more support of our community colleges which help with both trades and apprenticeships, a skillset before going to a four-year institution will help to reduce the cost of a college education.” [Johnson County GOP Candidate Forum, 00:09:30, 4/24/20] (VIDEO)

**Miller-Meeks Blamed School Closures During The December 2021 Omicron Wave On Teachers Refusing To Return To In-Person Instruction**

**Miller-Meeks Said Some Schools Were “Going To Go Back To Hybrid Learning Because Of The Omicron Variant, Which To This Point Has Had Very Little Fatalities.”** MILLER-MEEKS: “And we just had another publication about that this week. Failing grades are rising, and child suicide rates are surging, and yet some schools remain remote or hybrid, despite no scientific basis for this decision. And we heard again this week that schools in certain states are going to go back to hybrid learning because of the Omicron variant, which to this point has had very little fatalities.” [YouTube, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 12/14/21] (VIDEO) 00:01:44

**Miller-Meeks: “Teachers Were Prioritized For Vaccines” But “They Refused To Return To In-Person Instruction.”** MILLER-MEEKS: “And one of the greatest problems today that we see, and I see, I've been told for over a year to listen to the science, and I listen to the science. But I see that there's a lack of evidence-based decision making from the Biden administration. And one example of this is what's happening in schools. President Biden promised to support a return to safe learning as quickly as possible. Yet, even as the teachers were prioritized for vaccines, they refused to return to in-person instruction. Students' learning loss due to remote or hybrid learning is astronomical.” [YouTube, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 12/14/21] (VIDEO) 00:01:12
**Miller-Meeks Blamed The American Federation Of Teachers (AFT) For COVID-19 School Closures And Said AFT “Was Providing Verbatim Edits To Scientific And Medical Guidance”**

Miller-Meeks: “The Democrats And The Teachers’ Union Kept Schools Closed.” “MILLER-MEEKS: The Democrats and the teachers’ union kept schools closed. And now, not only has a generation of young children been robbed of a year of education, but mental health problems are up 31 percent, drug use and addiction resulting in overdose have exploded, and children as young as nine have committed suicide, all traced back to the shuttering of schools. Now we know who is responsible, the teachers’ union. Union involvement in the drafting and editing of scientific guidance is the very definition of political meddling. It is unclear how many children were locked out of school because of the union’s selfishness. And even today, summer camps don’t have guidance from the CDC on reopening without masks. Do th--do they need to hire the AFT? The lives of American children must be governed by medical science and not political science.” [CQ, 5/19/21]

Miller-Meeks Claimed That The American Federation Of Teachers (AFT) “Is Providing Verbatim Edits To Scientific And Medical Guidance At The CDC's Request.” “MILLER-MEEKS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. On May 11th, committee Republicans sent a letter to the CDC about the apparent influence of the American Federation of Teachers on official government documents. We have yet to receive a response. The AFT is not a medical group. It is not a scientific group. Yet it is providing verbatim edits to scientific and meddle--medical guidance at the CDC's request. Chairman Clyburn and the House Democrats spent the better part of a year investigating alleged influence at the CDC but remain silent on these egregious reports. This is influenced by political operatives that are both unelected and unaffiliated with the federal government. As one of the two medical experts on this committee, this is appalling. President Biden pr--promised his administration would follow science and truth. Director Walensky said the guidance was free from medical meddling. A paper trail shows this to be patently false. Biden's secretary of Education said ‘in-person learning offers our young people the best opportunity.’ Why not listen to him?” [CQ, 5/19/21]

- Select Committee Republicans Tweeted That Miller-Meeks “Blasted The Biden Administration And The @CDCgov For Allowing The American Federation Of Teachers To Meddle In And Draft Scientific Guidance Regarding Reopening Schools.” “Today, @RepMMM blasted the Biden Administration and the @CDCgov for allowing the American Federation of Teachers to meddle in and draft scientific guidance regarding reopening schools. America's classrooms should be governed by medical science.” [Twitter, @SelectGOP, 5/19/21] (VIDEO)

May 2021: Miller-Meeks Wrote A Letter To CDC Director Dr. Rochelle Walensky Condemning The Agency’s Consulting The American Federation Of Teachers While Developing School Reopening Guidelines. “Today, May 6th, 2021, Reps. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02) and Greg Murphy (NC-03), both doctors and members of the House Veterans’ Affairs and Education & Labor Committees, wrote a letter to Dr. Rochelle Walensky, Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, demanding more information regarding the American Federation of Teachers’ influence on school reopening guidelines: In the letter, the Members write: ‘The New York Post recently reported on the outsized influence teachers’ unions had over the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) when the agency was developing updated school reopening guidance in February. This report is alarming considering the significant national outcry from parents to follow the well-established science and get schools reopened.’ The Members continued: ‘It is imperative the CDC rise above politics and focus on the science, including studying virus transmission and the academic well-being and mental and physical health of students. Failing to put students first is a breach of responsibility.’” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 5/6/21]

**Miller-Meeks Joined Fellow Republicans To Launch “A Probe Into Improper Outside Influence” On CDC School Reopening Guidelines By The American Federation Of Teachers (AFT)**

May 2021: Miller-Meeks Joined Fellow Republicans To Launch “A Probe Into Improper Outside Influence”
On CDC School Reopening Guidelines By The American Federation Of Teachers (AFT). “Today, May 11th, 2021, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02) joined members of the Select Subcommittee on the Coronavirus Crisis and the House Committee on Oversight and Reform in launching a probe into improper outside influence on the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) school reopening guidance by the American Federation of Teachers (AFT). ‘President Biden failed America’s children when he bowed down to the bosses at the AFT rather than following the science and standing up for what is best for young students. The lives and education of America’s children must be governed by medical science, not political science,’ wrote the Republican lawmakers in a letter to CDC Director Dr. Rochelle Walensky. On February 12, 2021, the CDC released the Operational Strategy for reopening schools. According to emails obtained by Americans for Public Trust, the AFT was provided a pre-release copy of the CDC’s school reopening guidance and successfully lobbied the CDC to change its final guidance that advised keeping more than 90 percent of schools closed. Currently, less than 50 percent of schools are fully reopened, despite experts saying there is no medical reason students cannot return to in-person learning.” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 5/11/21]

- **The Letter Claimed That The AFT “Was Able To Successfully Bully The Public Health Experts At The CDC Into Politicizing The Guidance.”** “On February 12, 2021, the CDC released the Operational Strategy for reopening schools. According to emails obtained by Americans for Public Trust, the AFT was provided a pre-release copy of the CDC’s school reopening guidance and successfully lobbied the CDC to change its final guidance that advised keeping more than 90 percent of schools closed. Currently, less than 50 percent of schools are fully reopened, despite experts saying there is no medical reason students cannot return to in-person learning. The Republican lawmakers concluded, ‘The AFT was able to successfully bully the public health experts at the CDC into politicizing the guidance … It is unclear how many children were locked out of classrooms and negatively impacted by this disturbing change.’ As part of their probe, the Republican lawmakers call on Dr. Walensky to provide all documents, communications, and information related to the Operational Strategy, including those from the AFT, by May 25, 2021, as well as a briefing no later than May 18, 2021.” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 5/11/21]

**July 2021: Miller-Meeks Said “All Schools Need To Be Open For In Person Learning This Fall”**

July 2021: Miller-Meeks Said “All Schools Need To Be Open For In Person Learning This Fall” And Shared An Article About CDC Guidance On Masks For Fully Vaccinated Students And Teachers. “Finally, and yes all schools need to be open for in person learning this fall: Fully Vaccinated Students, Teachers Don't Need Masks: CDC. LINK: Buzzfeed News: In A Bid To Reopen Schools, The CDC Said Fully Vaccinated Students And Teachers Don't Need Masks.” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 7/9/21]

**February 2021: Miller-Meeks Called For The United States To “Listen To The Scientists And Reopen Our Schools Immediately”**

February 2021: Miller-Meeks Called For The United States To “Listen To The Scientists And Reopen Our Schools Immediately.” We should never allow teachers unions or any other entity to make unscientific decisions that affect the health and well-being of our children. We must listen to the scientists and reopen our schools immediately. [Washington Times, Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Brad Wenstrup, Andy Harris, and Michael Burgess Op-Ed, 2/9/21]

February 2021: Miller-Meeks Said “The New CDC Guidance Repeats What I Have Said For Months, It Is Beyond Time To Follow The Science And Reopen Our Schools.” “Today, February 12th, 2021, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02), released the following statement on the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) issuing guidance to have students safely return to in-person learning as soon as possible: ‘The new CDC guidance repeats what I have said for months, it is beyond time to follow the science and reopen our schools. I hope the Biden Administration keeps to its promises to listen to science. Our children are falling behind socially, academically, and their mental health is declining. For our children, we must act quickly.’ Earlier this week, Miller-Meeks, a veteran, physician, and former President of the Iowa Medical Society, penned an op-ed in The
Washington Times with her fellow Doctors Caucus members, Reps. Brad Wenstrup (OH-02), Michael Burgess (TX-26), and Andy Harris (MD-01), on the importance of following the science and reopening schools.” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 2/12/21]

**Miller-Meeks Attributed “The Rate Of Depression, Mental Health Issues And Suicide Among Students As Young As Nine Years Old” To Schools Moving Online During COVID-19**

**Miller-Meeks Attributed “The Rate Of Depression, Mental Health Issues And Suicide Among Students As Young As Nine Years Old” To Schools Moving Online During COVID-19.** “MILLER-MEEKS: My time is limited but speaking of the pandemic and I would say that we spend more per student than almost any other country and have mixed results but Dr. Murphy and I on Ed and Labor together sent a letter on May 6 to Dr. Walensky the Director of the CDC raising concerns about reports that teachers unions inappropriately exerted political pressure on the Biden administration to influence CDC health guidelines on reopening schools. The reason this is important is because in closing schools the rate of depression, mental health issues and suicide among students as young as nine years old have escalated, 31 percent increase in mental health issues. Do you agree it's inappropriate for teachers unions to exert political pressure on health officials and do you agree that health decisions should instead be based on the evidence?” [CQ, 6/24/21]

**Miller-Meeks Cited An Increase In Clark County, Nevada Student Suicides As “A Glaring Example Of The Serious Mental Anguish Children Are Enduring” From Doing School From Home.** “The data is clear. Unfortunately, some of our nation’s public schools are failing our children. Virtual learning yields subpar results, and many students are falling further behind, especially those in low-income and underprivileged communities. Additionally, Clark County, Nevada, serves as a glaring example of the serious mental anguish children are enduring, as they have already had double the number of student suicides compared to last year. Unfortunately, the detrimental effects of keeping kids home are great, which is why the American Academy of Pediatrics has stressed the importance of students returning to in-person learning.” [Washington Times, Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Brad Wenstrup, Andy Harris, and Michael Burgess Op-Ed, 2/9/21]

**Miller-Meeks Opposed School Mask Mandates And Suggested They Were Not Effective**

**Miller-Meeks: “If You Watch How Children Wear Masks, That They Probably Are Contaminating Themselves And Their Masks If, In Fact, They're Infected Than If They Were Wearing No Mask At All.”** “But we also know that it's had a very deleterious effect to the mental health of children, and this also includes the masking. And I know it's been mentioned by other members, but I think it bears witness that the American Academy of -- or American Journal of Pediatrics had published last August that transmission rates in children were very low to miniscule, a little bit different with the delta variant, however. But we know that in other countries, other European countries, Scandinavian countries, UK, that they are not requiring masking of children in the elementary levels nor under age 11 and certainly not in kindergarten. And I think to -- if you watch how children wear masks, that they probably are contaminating themselves and their masks if, in fact, they're infected than if they were wearing no mask at all. And better handwashing might be a mitigation strategy that would be extraordinarily helpful.” [CQ, 11/17/21]

**Miller-Meeks Joined A Letter With 31 House Republicans Calling On The CDC To Publicly Lay Out The Science Behind Their Decision To Recommend Children Wear Masks In School.** “U.S. Congressman Jay Obernolte (CA-08) and 32 members of the U.S. House of Representatives have called on Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) Director Rochelle Walensky to publicly lay out the science behind their decision to recommend children wear masks in school. ‘We have been repeatedly told to trust the science regarding how the CDC creates its policies, yet the lack of transparency in how this recommendation was made and the absence of studies to support it is both concerning and extremely frustrating to parents of school-aged children. Therefore, as schools are set to reopen under strict and tenuously justified mask mandates based on CDC recommendations, we respectfully request answers to these questions,’ stated the lawmakers in a letter to Director Walensky. […] The letter, led by Rep. Obernolte and signed by 33 members of Congress including […] Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-
Miller-Meeks: “To Say We’re Not Going To Let Children Go Back To School Unless They’re Wearing Masks Is Not Following The Science.” “We have known for over a year that children don’t transmit the virus. So delaying children going to summer camps, being outdoors where there’s almost infinitesimally low transmission, it seems absurd to have children wearing masks when they’re outdoors playing in sports and certainly in the elementary age group. I think to say we’re not going to let children go back to school unless they’re wearing masks is not following the science.” [Fox Business, 7/14/21] (VIDEO) 00:01:50

Business Exposures And Liability

Miller-Meeks Dismissed Reports That Meatpacking Companies Were Responsible For Outbreaks Among Workers At Their Plants

After A Report Was Released About COVID Among Meatpacking Employees, Miller-Meeks Said The Majority Of COVID Cases At The JBS Plant In Ottumwa Came From “In The Home Or Other Living Conditions Or In Transportation With Carpooling” And Not From Inside The Plant. “Iowa Congresswoman Mariannette Miller-Meeks is defending how the meatpacking plant in her hometown of Ottumwa responded in the first weeks of the pandemic. ‘Let’s not forget that even experts like Dr. Fauci didn’t know what was going on in those early months and guidance was changing daily,’ Miller-Meeks said today during a U.S. House subcommittee hearing. A new congressional report has found at least 269 employees at the five largest U.S. meatpacking companies died of Covid during the first year of the pandemic — three times higher than previously reported — and 59,000 U.S. packing plant employees tested positive for the virus. Miller-Meeks, a Republican, is a member of the U.S. House Select Subcommittee on the Coronavirus Crisis and she is pushing back on the idea the majority of JBS workers in Ottumwa who contracted Covid got the virus inside the plant. ‘People don’t spend 24 hours a day at their workplace,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘They are at home or in their community and our contract tracing showed that most of our spread came from in the home or other living conditions or in transportation with carpooling.’” [Radio Iowa, 10/27/21]

Miller-Meeks Defended Meatpacking Plants’ Handling Of COVID-19 And Said They Took Aggressive Protective Measures Early On In The Pandemic. “Berkowitz testified at a congressional hearing following the release of a report that found more than 59,000 workers at the nation’s top meat processing companies’ plants were infected with the coronavirus in the first year of the pandemic and at least 269 workers died. […] Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, a Republican who represents eastern Iowa, pushed back against Berkowitz and the report’s findings. She argued plants, like the JBS pork facility in her district of Ottumwa, took aggressive protective measures early on and pointed to the impact that closing the plants had on the food supply chain. ‘Do any of you know how many farmers had to euthanize their herds? Do any of you how many farmers committed suicide? Because that happened in my district when farmers had no place to take their hogs or their beef or their chickens,’ Miller-Meeks said.” [Iowa Public Radio, 12/15/21]

Miller-Meeks Defended Meatpacking Companies’ Response To The COVID-19 Pandemic And Said, “Even Experts Like Dr. Fauci Didn’t Know What Was Going On In Those Early Months.” “The numbers of meatpacking workers infected and killed by the coronavirus are much higher than previously known, a congressional review has found. More than 59,000 workers of the country’s five largest meatpackers were infected, and about 270 died, according to a report by the House Select Subcommittee on the Coronavirus Crisis that was made public Wednesday. […] U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, R-Iowa, is a subcommittee member who defended the companies’ response to the pandemic. She said she personally verified that a plant in her hometown of Ottumwa had implemented a variety of safety precautions in April and May 2020. ‘Let’s not forget that even experts like Dr. Fauci didn’t know what was going on in those early months, and guidance was changing daily,’ she said Wednesday, in reference to Dr. Anthony Fauci, the nation’s leading infectious disease expert.” [Iowa Capital Dispatch, 10/27/21]
Miller-Meeks Voted To Shield Businesses And Health Facilities From Liability Related To COVID Exposure

Miller-Meeks Voted To Advance Legislation Minimizing Legal Liability For COVID-19 Exposure And Damages In Health Care Facilities And Corporations. “When the Iowa Legislature reconvened in June to wrap up a session interrupted by the pandemic, Miller-Meeks joined her Republican colleagues in advancing legislation to prohibit Iowans from suing a company or health care facility unless they were hospitalized or died due to COVID-19, or if an individual could prove a company intended to cause them harm. The bill also protected companies from coronavirus-related civil damages unless they intentionally exposed an employee to the disease or ‘recklessly’ disregarded government guidance on how to minimize exposure. Gov. Kim Reynolds signed the legislation — which also has been a priority of national Republicans — into law June 18.” [Iowa Starting Line, 9/23/20]

2020: Miller-Meeks Voted For Establishing Legal Protections For Business And Health Care Providers During COVID-19. Miller-Meeks voted for SF 2338, “A bill for an act relating to civil actions, including recoverable damages for medical expenses, evidence offered to prove past medical expenses, and civil actions related to the novel coronavirus, and including retroactive applicability provisions.” The bill passed by vote 30-20. [Iowa State Legislature, SF 2338, 6/10/20]

- SF 2338 Removed Liability For Injuries Related To COVID-19 Exposures At Work. “NEW SECTION. 686D.5 Safe harbor for compliance with regulations, executive orders, or public health guidance. A person in this state shall not be held liable for civil damages for any injuries sustained from exposure or potential exposure to COVID-19 if the act or omission alleged to violate a duty of care was in substantial compliance or was consistent with any federal or state statute, regulation order, or public health guidance related to COVID-19 that was applicable to the person or activity at issue at the time of alleged exposure or potential exposure.” [Iowa State Legislature, SF 2338, 6/10/20]

2020: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Amendment S-5128 To SF 2338, Which Would Have Created Whistleblower Protections For Workers Who Raise Concerns About COVID-19. “NEW SECTION. 686D.9 Employee reporting of COVID-19 —— right to avoid exposure —— civil penalty. 1. A person shall not discharge or in any manner discriminate against an employee because the employee has filed a complaint or instituted or caused to be instituted a proceeding under or related to any condition of employment that the employee believes to pose an undue risk of a COVID-19 infection or has testified or is about to testify in any such proceeding or because of the exercise by the employee on behalf of the employee or others of a right afforded by this chapter. 2. A person shall not discharge or in any manner discriminate against an employee because the employee, who with no reasonable alternative, refuses in good faith to be exposed to COVID-19; provided the employee, where possible, has first sought through resort to regular statutory enforcement channels, unless there has been insufficient time due to the urgency of the situation, or the employee has sought and been unable to obtain from the person a correction of the dangerous condition.” The amendment lost 17-32. [Iowa State Legislature, SF 2338 Am. S-5128, 6/10/20]

Lockdowns

Miller-Meeks Said She Would Have Recommended A 2-3 Week Lockdown At The Beginning Of The Pandemic, But Later Said She Opposed Pandemic Closures

Miller-Meeks Said She Would Have Recommended Shutting Down Travel, Increased Testing, Sheltering At Home And Closed Businesses For Two To Three Weeks Had The President Had Asked Her For Advice. “It’s very easy to play Monday morning quarterback now that we have more information. But given the information that we had at the time, I would have advised shutting down travel from China and from Europe, I would have recommended increased testing based on the what information we did have coming out of China, even though it was false, but they did release the genomic sequence. I would have ramped up testing I would have advised for there to be on sheltering at home and closing of businesses for two to three weeks, but then to reopen those once we
understood what the what population was most, who is most likely to die, and then who was the least likely to have symptoms to be drastically ill and would have been opened up the economy but continued to have testing, continue to have contact tracing and surveillance while working on serology, fast tracking of vaccine.” [Marion County GOP Congressional Forum. 00:35:16, 5/14/20] (VIDEO)

September 2020: Miller-Meeks: “I Do Not Agree With Closing The Economy To Handle The Pandemic.”
“Miller-Meeks fielded questions from business representatives on a variety of topics. (Hart will have a similar session at 10 a.m. Oct. 22). The sessions were arranged by the Partnership, Young Professionals Connection and the Greater Des Moines Leadership Institute. […] ‘I do not agree with closing the economy to handle the pandemic. I think we need to learn from this.’” [Iowa Capital Dispatch, 9/10/20]

Lab Leak Theory

Miller-Meeks Repeatedly Promoted The “Lab Leak” Theory Of How The COVID-19 Outbreak Began And Demanded Investigations Into The Circumstances Of The Theory

Miller-Meeks: “We Must Investigate The Use Of Taxpayer Funds For Gain-Of-Function Research In Wuhan.” “For months I have called for a thorough investigation into the origins of COVID-19. Now we must investigate the use of taxpayer funds for gain-of-function research in Wuhan. @RandPaul was attacked for simply suggesting this research was occurring. We need answers.” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 10/21/21]

Miller-Meeks: The Lab Leak Theory Of The Origin Of COVID-19 Was “The Most Plausible Scenario.” MILLER-MEEKS: “Well, it’s not a surprise. We know that China has not been transparent or forthcoming about what happened. They have been very vociferous in denying that there was any laboratory leak, but they’ve been covering up since this time. We know from the hearing that we had in Congress that for this to be of natural origin, zoonotic origin, was very low likelihood. And even Dr. Tedros, the Director of the WHO, said that definitely a leak from the laboratory was on the table. And I think as more evidence comes out, we’re going to find that that’s the most plausible scenario.” [Fox Business, 8/12/21] (VIDEO) 00:00:29

Miller-Meeks Said There Was Evidence, “Even Though It’s Circumstantial.” That “Certainly Leads Us To Believe” COVID-19 Started Much Earlier Than Official Proclamations. (2:20) MILLER-MEEKS: “Well the official outbreak they said started in December. We already have information that it started earlier than that. We know that there were three laboratory workers who became ill and were hospitalized. That was in November. We know that there was military sports games that happened in October and that there were athletes from around the world. They said that Wuhan was in a lockdown. They didn’t have media, they didn’t have fan, you know it was like a ghost town in Wuhan and that several of the athletes became ill and had COVID like symptoms as we would call them now. So we know that it looks like the virus started much earlier than that. We have that evidence, even though it’s circumstantial it certainly leads us to believe that the virus started much earlier than what the official proclamation is and as we’ve said China has continued to downplay any possibility that this leaked from a lab.” [Fox Business, 8/12/21] (VIDEO) 00:02:20

Miller-Meeks Said There Was “Credible Information” That COVID-19 Originated In A Laboratory And Was Not Naturally Occurring. “Sunday, on FNC’s ‘The Next Revolution,’ Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (R-IA) stressed the importance of investigating the origins of COVID-19, and in particular, China’s role. Miller-Meeks told host Steve Hilton that she believed ‘credible information’ showed the origins were a laboratory leak and not naturally occurring.” [Breitbart, 7/26/21]

Miller-Meeks: “I Would Tend To Agree That This Virus Came From The Laboratory.” “And I think as they said, and I would tend to agree that this virus came from the laboratory, whether it was a leak, whether it was accidental, whether it was intentional, whether it was manmade or whether it was a virus that they brought into the laboratory and then worked through gain-of-function research to enhance its human-to-human transmission and also its virulence or pathogenicity that that occurred in the laboratory and it least from the laboratory. So I think that
right now, all the credible scientific information looks like it was, you know, a leak from a laboratory and it was not of zoonotic origin.” [Fox Business, 7/26/21] (VIDEO) 00:03:06

Miller-Meeks On The COVID-19 Lab Leak Theory: “Criminals Have Been Convicted On Less Circumstantial Evidence Than Currently Exists, And Every Day More Evidence Has Revealed.” “As for the lab leak theory, one after another, Republicans framed the issue as virtually settled: Research at a virus laboratory in Wuhan, China, created the novel coronavirus through risky ‘gain of function’ experiments, then leaked it into the world. ‘Criminals have been convicted on less circumstantial evidence than currently exists, and every day more evidence has revealed,’ Representative Mariannette Miller-Meeks of Iowa said.” [New York Times, 7/22/21]

Miller-Meeks Voted Against Blocking Consideration Of The COVID-19 Origin Act. In July 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against: “Ross, D-N.C., motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and possibility of amendment)” According to the Congressional Record, Rep. Burgess said, “Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to immediately consider S. 1867, the COVID-19 Origin Act, introduced by Senator Hawley. It has been 55 days since the Senate passed this critical bill without a single dissenting vote. Declassifying intelligence surrounding the origin of COVID-19 is imperative and key to the House Republican plan to hold China accountable for the pandemic.” A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of the bill. The motion was agreed to by a vote of 216-207. [H Res 535, Vote #210, 7/20/21; CQ, 7/20/21; Congressional Record, 7/20/21]

Miller-Meeks: Recent Information About COVID-19 “Pretty Much Indicate[d] That This Virus Emerged From The Laboratory” But May Have Been Captured And Amplified Or Entirely Manmade. MILLER-MEEKS: “The other testimony about how particularly scientists or doctors felt about their interactions with China were that there would be repercussions if they did not in fact suppress or dampen any knowledge that the virus may have emanated from the Wuhan Institute of Virology. And I think the science and especially what we heard today pretty much indicates that this virus emerged from the laboratory. Whether it was a virus that was captured and brought to the lab to work on and to amplify through gain-of-function research or if it was manmade, that we don’t know.” [Fox Business, 6/30/21] (VIDEO) 00:01:56

Miller-Meeks And Other House Republicans Announced A Plan To Hold Hearings To Investigate The Origin Of COVID-19. “House Republicans on Thursday demanded that House Speaker Nancy Pelosi, D-Calif., hold hearings to investigate the origin of the coronavirus, saying at a press conference that they plan to hold their own hearing on the topic since Democrats won't. House Minority Whip Steve Scalise, R-La., made the announcement at a press event with House GOP Conference Chair Elise Stefanik, R-N.Y., and members of the GOP Doctors Caucus. […] Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, R-Iowa, said Thursday that it's vital to figure out where the virus came from no matter where that was. ‘It matters for public health, it matters for national security, and more importantly it matters because how we address the next pandemic,’ she said.” [Fox News, 6/24/21]


Miller-Meeks Said She Believed COVID-19 Originated In The Wuhan Institute Of Virology Lab. PRICE: “You mentioned COVID-19, as you sit here at this moment, do you believe that COVID-19 originated in that lab in China? Does it look more like that that is what happened in your mind?” MILLER-MEEKS: “Yes, I believe that the virus originated in the laboratory. I remember March and April of last year, I was communicating and texting with other physicians about the possibility. We had read the journal report from the two scientists in China that had stated it had originated from the lab. And I think everything points to that, especially the Chinese Communist Party's denial that it emanated from the lab, their disinformation campaign early on, the fact that there was circuitous funding to the Wuhan Institute of Virology, the lack of an intermediate host, we don't have an intermediate host at this point in time, and the knowledge that there had been previous breaks in security, lax security, and leaks in this laboratory before, I think all point to that.” [YouTube, WHO13, 6/20/21] (VIDEO) 00:03:24

Miller-Meeks Claimed The Wuhan Institute Of Virology Was “Probably Where This Virus Emanated.”
MILLER-MEEKS: “Well, certainly the WHO is compromised, and that’s why we need to have US researchers, US scientists to be able to go into China, to the Wuhan Institute of Virology and look at the books, look at laboratories, and look at processes within the Wuhan Institute of Virology, which is probably where this virus emanated.” [Fox Business, 6/14/21] (VIDEO) 00:00:57

**Politicization**

**Miller-Meek Praised Trump And Gov. Reynolds On Their COVID-19 Response, Later Attacking Biden And Democratic Governors On Theirs**

**Miller-Meeks Praised Gov. Reynolds For “Making IA Most Resilient State Through Pandemic.”** “Thank you Governor @KimReynoldsIA for making IA most resilient state through pandemic.” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 11/23/21]

April 2021: **Miller-Meeks Said She Thought Trump Was Not Receiving Enough Credit For The Country’s Response To COVID-19.** “Miller-Meeks said she felt former President Donald Trump wasn’t receiving enough credit for the country’s response to the coronavirus pandemic, particularly Operation Warp Speed, which she said, ‘miraculously gave us three safe and effective vaccines in just nine months.’” [Ames Tribune, 4/29/21]

**Miller-Meeks Said She Thought The Way Trump Had Responded To The Pandemic Was A Good Example Of Federalism.** At a Muscatine County GOP Forum, Miller-Meeks was asked “What is the proper role of the federal government?” Miller-Meeks responded “And I think you’ve seen an example of federalism in how President Trump has responded to the pandemic and the Coronavirus and we’ve also seen the excesses of some of the governors who have really been much more authoritarian and dictatorial of they’ve responded to the pandemic within their state. So it’s a great example of federalism in response to the pandemic.” [Muscatine County GOP Forum, 00:24:48, 5/26/20] (VIDEO)

**Miller-Meeks Praised Trump And Governor Reynolds For The Way They Handled The Pandemic.** At a Lee County GOP Candidate Forum, Miller-Meeks stated “So I think both President Trump and Governor Reynolds handled this situation, the pandemic, the way they should have handled it, especially watching what was coming out of New York. […] So Governor Reynolds, I think had the appropriate actions. There are governors that certainly had an authoritarian crackdown and went way too far. I think people are willing to comply, they’re willing to shelter at home, go out when necessary as we started the pandemic, as long as it seems reasonable and pragmatic given what we know about the virus.” [Lee County GOP Candidate Forum, 00:51:00, 5/12/20] (VIDEO)

**Miller-Meeks Said The Biden Administration “Botched” The COVID-19 Vaccine Rollout.** “Despite this administration having 3 effective vaccines: botched roll-out, 2nd dose should have been delayed and those with infection acquired natural immunity could have avoided vaccination until humoral & T cells AB’s waned” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 10/8/21]

**Miller-Meeks Said Biden Did Not Want To Hold Democratic Governors Accountable For Putting COVID-19 Patients Back Into Nursing Homes.** “On Monday’s broadcast of the Fox Business Network’s ‘Evening Edit,’ Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (R-IA) argued that the Biden administration doesn’t want to hold governors who put coronavirus patients back into nursing homes accountable ‘for their egregious actions’ that went against science. Miller-Meeks said, [relevant remarks begin around 2:15] ‘They’ve been inconsistent across the board. And they’re not wanting to hold Democrat governors accountable for their egregious actions through the pandemic, which — putting infected patients back into nursing homes in a closed environment in these northern states was atrocious, and that was against the science and against the CDC guidelines at the time.’” [Breitbart, 1/1/22]

**Miller-Meeks Said Biden’s Apparent Reversal On Federal COVID-19 Safety Mandates “Underscores Another Failure” Of The Biden Administration.** “Wednesday on Fox News Channel’s ‘America’s Newsroom,’ Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (R-IA) slammed the Biden administration’s ‘differing responses and
contradictions’ when it comes to handling the coronavirus pandemic. Miller-Meeks, a physician, said President Joe Biden’s apparent reversal on federal mandates ‘underscores another failure’ of the administration. ‘I think it just underscores another failure of the Biden administration,’ Miller-Meeks stated. ‘So, remember last year, the Democrats politicized the pandemic in order to affect the results of the election. And so, when they came in that they were going to, you know, get us through the pandemic, they were going to cure the pandemic, and they were going to get us back onto a path of normalcy. They also weren’t going to mandate vaccines, so they knew they were coming into office with vaccines that were going to be approved, and they had three vaccines early on. They bungled the roll-out of the vaccines. Then they had the HHS take over distribution of monoclonal antibodies, so now we know there is a shortage of monoclonal antibodies. And then they had the opportunity to pre-order tests, and I think I was the first physician, doctor congresswoman to mention on Monday on Fox News that the rapid antigen test, according to a study from Reuters out of Belgium, is not as effective in detecting it.’” [Breitbart, 12/29/21]

Miller-Meeks: In 2020, “Democrats Politicized The Pandemic In Order To Affect The Results Of The Election.” “I think it just underscores another failure of the Biden administration,’ Miller-Meeks stated. ‘So, remember last year, the Democrats politicized the pandemic in order to affect the results of the election. And so, when they came in that they were going to, you know, get us through the pandemic, they were going to cure the pandemic, and they were going to get us back onto a path of normalcy. They also weren’t going to mandate vaccines, so they knew they were coming into office with vaccines that were going to be approved, and they had three vaccines early on. They bungled the roll-out of the vaccines. Then they had the HHS take over distribution of monoclonal antibodies, so now we know there is a shortage of monoclonal antibodies. And then they had the opportunity to pre-order tests, and I think I was the first physician, doctor congresswoman to mention on Monday on Fox News that the rapid antigen test, according to a study from Reuters out of Belgium, is not as effective in detecting it.’” [Breitbart, 12/29/21]

Manufacturing & PPE

October 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted For Strengthening The Strategic National Stockpile With Medical Supplies For Emergency Health Security. In October 2021 Miller-Meeks voted for: “Pallone, D-N.J., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill that would authorize funding for and require the Health and Human Services Department to take actions to strengthen the National Strategic Stockpile. Through fiscal 2024, it would authorize $705 million annually for the stockpile to maintain drugs, vaccines, medical devices and other medical supplies to provide for national emergency health security needs; $500 million annually for a new supply chain flexibility manufacturing pilot program to improve domestic reserves of critical medical supplies; and $3.5 billion annually for a new pilot grant program to help states expand or maintain strategic stockpiles of medical supplies. Among other provisions, it would require HHS to ensure that contents of the stockpile are in good working order, submit a report to Congress every 30 days on all state and local requests for supplies related to the COVID-19 pandemic and improve processes for the use and distribution of supplies from the stockpile.” The motion was agreed to by a vote of 397-22. [H.R. 3635, Vote #322, 10/20/21; CQ, 10/20/21]

Daily Nonpareil: Miller-Meeks Joined The House Committee Overseeing The National Strategic Stockpile She Had Vowed To Use To Bring Medical Manufacturing Back To The United States From China. “Miller-Meeks, a physician, was assigned a seat this week on the House Homeland Security Committee, along with Veterans’ Affairs and Education and Labor committees. […] The Homeland Security Committee has legislative jurisdiction over the National Strategic Stockpile. While campaigning this past fall, Miller-Meeks frequently highlighted the stockpile’s value in preparing the country for future pandemics, vowing to draw on her military and public health experience to revamp it and bring manufacturing back from China to address limited domestic medical supplies — including personal protective equipment and pharmaceuticals. In an August column, Miller-Meeks advocated that Congress quickly consider adopting new rules for federal PPE purchases that restricts the U.S. Department of Defense from purchasing certain products from foreign sources to create ‘a stable demand for U.S.-made PPE that will incentivize investment in domestic PPE manufacturing.’” [Daily Nonpareil, 1/27/21]
January 2021: Upon Her Swearing In, Miller-Meeks Cited Pandemic Preparedness, Infrastructure, And Bringing Manufacturing, Especially That Of PPE And Pharmaceuticals, “Back From China.” “Miller-Meeks said she is hopeful the diverse class of female freshmen will lend itself to more bipartisanship in a divided Congress, with narrow margins in both the House and Senate. ‘I think there are avenues and things that we can agree on, and I think there is an appetite to work together and accomplish that,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘I think you especially see that in the women legislators, but in all legislators. ... I do think we can accomplish things and we can, you know, move things in a bipartisan fashion.’ She said that includes ‘getting through pandemic and preparing for the next pandemic’; ‘bringing manufacturing back from China’ to address limited domestic stockpiles in medical supplies — including personal protective equipment (PPE) and pharmaceuticals — as the nation grapples with containing COVID-19; and pushing forward a long-stalled infrastructure spending bill to upgrade the nation’s roads, bridges, locks and dams, and expand high-speed broadband internet service to rural and urban areas.” [Quad-City Times, 1/3/21]

November 2020: Miller-Meeks Said She Would Work To Bring Manufacturing Back From China To Increase Domestic PPE And Pharmaceutical Production. “Miller-Meeks also fielded questions about the pandemic, stating her first priority if elected to Congress will be to address COVID-19. That includes working to bring manufacturing back from China to increase domestic production of personal protective equipment and pharmaceuticals, and beefing up and adding reagents and testing supplies to the national repository of antibiotics, vaccines, ventilators and other critical medical supplies.” [Quad-City Times, 11/3/20]

October 2020: Miller-Meeks Said She Would Push To Increase The National Repository Of Ventilators, Antibiotics, And Vaccines. “Both have agreed that Congress needs to act quickly on a bipartisan solution to provide another wave of coronavirus relief, including additional unemployment benefits. Miller-Meeks, the former director of the Iowa Department of Public Health, said she would work to bring manufacturing back from China to increase domestic production of personal protective equipment and pharmaceuticals ‘so that we diversity our supply chain.’ Miller-Meeks said she would also push to increase the national repository of antibiotics, vaccines, ventilators and other critical medical supplies, and would ramp up testing with public and private research and hygienic laboratories, the CDC and FDA ‘to get testing done rapidly and broad-based.’” [Quad-City Times, 10/12/20]

August 2020: Miller-Meeks Suggested Creating A “Medical Reserve Workforce” Or “Public Health Corps” Of Volunteer Retired And Part-Time Health Care Workers. “Our leadership still has a lot to learn about how the federal government, states, local governments and the private sector can work together to effectively face a pandemic. That includes policies and public-private partnerships in concert with research institutions to create and deploy faster and better testing. An important step would be to increase the Centers for Medicaid and Medicare Services reimbursement for laboratory services so they are equipped to address pandemic level testing. Calling upon my military and public health background, I recommended in April that we should create a medical reserve workforce that could be deployed during a surge. The same concept could apply to a reserve Public Health Corps comprised of volunteer retired or part-time health care professionals to do testing and contact tracing that could be mobilized to any ‘hot spot.’” [Des Moines Register, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks Op-Ed, 8/24/20]

August 2020: Miller-Meeks Suggested The Government Compensate Private Firms To Store A Six-Month Supply Of PPE. “We should address both state and national strategic stockpiles and compensate private firms to store necessary PPE for six months and then re-introduce it back in the supply chain. This continual circulation will prevent expiration, mold or other degradation that makes PPE dysfunctional. Testing substances, called reagents, should be included in the national stockpile and allocated to state hygienic labs, private laboratories and hospital labs for broader-based, decentralized testing, allowing for quicker isolation and treatment of outbreaks.” [Des Moines Register, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks Op-Ed, 8/24/20]
Consumer Issues & Regulations

**Significant Findings**

- **2021**: Miller-Meeks voted against the Consumer Protection And Recovery Act, which authorized the FTC to pursue legal action on consumer protection violations.
- **2021**: Miller-Meeks voted against new SEC disclosure standards on environmental, social, and governance metrics.
- **2021**: Miller-Meeks voted against congressional disapproval of the Trump Administration’s third-party lending rule, which opened doors for predatory lenders.
- **2021**: Miller-Meeks voiced concerns about inflation and its effects on consumer prices.
- **2015**: Miller-Meeks criticized net neutrality, comparing it to a “Fairness Doctrine” for the internet.
- **2019**: Miller-Meeks said she supported the federal government breaking up social media monopolies.

**Federal Trade Commission**

**July 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Consumer Protection And Recovery Act, Which Authorized The FTC To Pursue Legal Action On Consumer Protection Violations**

Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Consumer Protection And Recovery Act, Authorizing The Federal Trade Commission To Take Legal Action Against Any Person, Partnership Or Corporation That Violated Consumer Protection Law In The Preceding 10 Years. In July 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against: “Passage of the bill that would authorize certain legal action by the Federal Trade Commission for legal violations under its jurisdiction and redress for such violations. Specifically, it would authorize the agency to take legal action in federal court against a person, partnership or corporation that has violated consumer protection law in the preceding 10 years. It would allow the FTC to seek in such cases restitution for losses, contract rescission or reform, money refund or property return, and disgorgement, or legally mandated repayment, of unjust enrichment that a person, partnership or corporation obtained from such a violation.” The bill passed 221 to 205. [HR 2668, Vote #214, 7/20/21; CQ, 7/20/21]

**Investor Transparency**

**June 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against New SEC Disclosure Standards On Environmental, Social, And Governance Metrics**

Miller-Meeks Voted Against A Bill That Established New Disclosure Standards For Publicly Traded Companies Related To Their Environmental, Social, And Governance Metrics. In June 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against: “Passage of the bill that would establish new disclosure requirements for publicly traded companies related to environmental, social, and governance (ESG) metrics; climate-related risks; political expenditures; executive pay; and tax information regarding overseas subsidiaries. It would direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to require publicly traded companies to disclose and define their ESG metrics as part of any filing that requires audited financial statements; require companies to disclose in any proxy or consent solicitation material for annual shareholder meetings a clear description of the link between ESG metrics and the company's long-term
business strategy and processes used to determine the impact of such metrics on the business strategy; and require the SEC to establish a sustainable finance advisory committee to identify investment challenges and opportunities associated with sustainable finance and recommend policies to facilitate sustainable investments. It would require publicly traded companies to include in annual reports to the SEC information related to risks posed to the company by climate change, including a description of actions taken to identify and mitigate such risks and an evaluation of potential financial impacts of risk-management strategies” The bill passed by vote of 215 to 214. [H R 1187, Vote #169, 6/16/21; CQ, 6/16/21]

Miller-Meeks Voted For An Amendment Requiring The SEC To Study Disclosure Frameworks Related To Climate Or Environmental, Social, And Governance Metrics Before Requiring Public Companies To Make Such Disclosures. In June 2021, Miller-Meeks voted for: “Hill, R-Ark., amendment no. 4 that would replace the text of the bill with a requirement that the Securities and Exchange Commission conduct a study of all disclosure frameworks related to the climate or environmental, social and governance metrics that any publicly traded company could use when making disclosures to investors voluntarily or by law. It would require the SEC to report to Congress on the study's findings and any inconsistencies between such disclosure frameworks, before it could require any new ESG or climate disclosures.” The amendment was rejected 204 to 225. [H R 1187, Vote #166, 6/16/21; CQ, 6/16/21]

Third-Party Lending

June 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Congressional Disapproval Of The Trump Administration’s Third-Party Lending Rule, Which Opened Doors For Predatory Lenders

June 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Congressional Disapproval Of The Trump Administration’s Third-Party Lending Rule. In June 2021, Miller-Meeks Voted Against: “Passage of the joint resolution that would provide for congressional disapproval of an October 2020 Office of the Comptroller of the Currency rule stating that national banks are considered the ‘true lender’ of a loan if, at the date of the loan's origination, the bank funds the loan or is named as lender in the loan agreement, including in the case of loans issued in partnerships between banks and third parties, such as online financial firms. The rule went into effect on Dec. 29, 2020, and effectively allows nonbank lenders to offer loans not subject to higher state interest rate caps by originating loans in partnership with a national bank in another state. Under the provisions of the joint resolution, the October 2020 rule would have no force or effect.” The resolution passed, 218-208. [SJ Res 15, Vote #181, 6/24/21; CQ, 6/24/21]

- Opponents Of The Rule Argued That It Left Consumers Vulnerable To Predatory “Rent-A-Bank” Schemes. “But Democrats — along with a coalition of consumer protection and faith groups — have fiercely opposed the rule, claiming it leaves customers vulnerable to predatory ‘rent-a-bank’ schemes. ‘States are taking measures to protect their constituents their consumers against these end-runs around their laws designed to prohibit these predatory practices. But last October, in the middle of the pandemic, when many working families were plunged into economic uncertainty and turmoil, the ‘Trump administration gave these rent-a-bank schemes a free pass to exploit these loopholes,’ said Sen. Chris Van Hollen (D-Md.), sponsor of the resolution to repeal the rule.” [The Hill, 5/11/21]

- “Rent-A-Bank” Schemes Were When “A Lender Temporarily Partners With A Bank To Evade Interest Rate Caps And Then Severs The Partnership After Taking Ownership Of The Loan.” “The OCC clamped down during the 2000s on rent-a-bank schemes, in which a lender temporarily partners with a bank to evade interest rate caps and then severs the partnership after taking ownership of the loan. Critics of the true lender rule say it will allow such schemes to flourish, particularly as nonbank online lenders make up a larger portion of the financial system.” [The Hill, 5/11/21]
**2021: Miller-Meeks Voiced Concerns About Inflation And Its Effects On Consumer Prices**

**Miller-Meeks: Inflation Was The “Most Insidious And Regressive Of Taxes And Breaks POTUS Promise Not To Raise Taxes On Anyone Making <$400,000.”** “Inflation: most insidious and regressive of taxes and breaks POTUS promise not to raise taxes on anyone making <$400,000. Massive govt spending -> inflation…” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 11/23/21]

**November 2021: Miller-Meeks Shared An Article About Consumer Prices That Cited “Surging Costs” For Housing.** “Prices for U.S. consumers jumped 6.2% in October compared with a year earlier as surging costs for food, gas and housing left Americans grappling with the highest inflation rate since 1990.”” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 11/10/21]

**Miller-Meeks: “Inflation Is An Insidious Tax, And A Regressive Tax, That Disproportionately Affects People Of Color, Low-Income Individuals, Working Families, And Seniors On A Fixed Income.”** “MARIANNETTE MILLER-MEEKS: So I think this has been very interesting testimony that we’ve heard today. So we have too much money chasing too few goods, which has led to inflation, which even the Fed Secretary, Jerome Powell, in his testimony here, acknowledged that inflation was in excess of what we have seen in several decades, although the administration is hoping that it is transitory. And we also know that inflation is an insidious tax, and a regressive tax, that disproportionately affects people of color, low-income individuals, working families, and seniors on a fixed income.” [CQ, 7/27/21]

**Internet & Tech**

**2015: Miller-Meeks Tweeted That Net Neutrality Was A “Fairness Doctrine” For The Internet**

**Miller-Meeks Tweet: Net Neutrality Was ‘‘Fairness Doctrine’ 4 Internet.”** “Net neutrality, sold as ‘better access to Internet’ via tiered pricing is ‘fairness doctrine’ 4 Internet. When hasn't Internet worked?” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 2/25/15]

**2019: Miller-Meeks Said She Supported The Federal Government Breaking Up Social Media Monopolies**

**Miller-Meeks Supported Federal Government Breaking Up Or Imposing Restrictions On Large Tech Companies Such As Facebook, Google, YouTube And Twitter.** “Scheinblum asked if the federal government should break up or impose restrictions on large organizations that limit free speech, such as Facebook, Google, YouTube and Twitter. Phillips agreed, noting he’s been reprimanded and restricted several times by Facebook for exercising ‘freedom of speech.’ […] Miller-Meeks agreed with breaking up social media monopolies and said, ‘We also know the traditional press is biased, so there’s very little avenue for discourse, discussion and debate in the public sphere.’” [Muscatine Journal, 5/27/20]

**Veterans’ Consumer Protections**

**September 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against An Amendment That Would Strengthen Servicemember Consumer Protections Related To Medical Debt And Credit Reporting**

September 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against An Amendment That Would Strengthen Servicemember Consumer Protections Related To Medical Debt And Credit Reporting. On September 22, 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against the “Tlaib, D-Mich., amendment no. 11 that would strengthen servicemember consumer protections with regard to medical debt collections and credit reporting, including by prohibiting the collection of medical debt for two years after a first payment is due and prohibiting debt arising from medically necessary procedures from ever appearing on servicemember credit reports.” The amendment was adopted 222 to 203. [CQ, 9/22/21; H.R.
June 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted For Imposing Harsher Fines On Those Who Seek To Defraud Veterans

June 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted For Imposing Harsher Fines On Those Who Seek To Defraud Veterans. In June 2021, Miller-Meeks Voted For: “Nadler, D-N.Y., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended, that would establish fines, prison sentences of up to five years, or both for individuals who engage in schemes to defraud individuals in connection with obtaining veterans' benefits.” The motion was agreed to, 416-5. [HR 983, Vote #174, 6/22/21; CQ, 6/22/21]
**Education Issues**

**Significant Findings**

✓ Miller-Meeks falsely claimed in July 2021 that children do not transmit COVID-19 and that requiring masks in school was “not following the science.”

✓ Miller-Meeks claimed elementary age students “don’t transmit [COVID-19] to adults or other children.”

✓ Miller-Meeks: “to say we’re not going to let children go back to school unless they’re wearing masks is not following the science.”

✓ September 2021: Miller-Meeks joined a letter calling on the CDC to publicly lay out the science behind their decision to recommend children wear masks in school.

✓ Miller-Meeks repeatedly criticized and opposed COVID-related school closures.

✓ Miller-Meeks blamed the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) for COVID-19 school closures and said AFT “was providing verbatim edits to scientific and medical guidance.”

✓ Miller-Meeks joined fellow Republicans to launch “a probe into improper outside influence” on CDC school reopening guidelines by the American Federation of Teachers.

✓ Miller-Meeks attributed “the rate of depression, mental health issues and suicide among students as young as nine years old” to schools moving online during COVID-19…

✓ …But in April 2020, Miller-Meeks said COVID-19 helped control the costs of education by having all classes online.

✓ Miller-Meeks opposed the American Rescue Plan’s funding to reopen schools, arguing “there are still billions in unspent funding for educational services from the previous COVID-19 relief packages.”

✓ Miller-Meeks opposed the Education Jobs and Medicaid Assistance Act of 2010, which was expected to save 140,000 teachers’ jobs, because it closed a tax loophole for corporations that outsource jobs.

   ✓ A fact check by the Cedar Rapids Gazette rated Rep. Loebsack’s claim that Miller-Meeks opposed the bill because it eliminated a tax break for outsourcing corporations “mostly true.”

✓ 2021: Miller-Meeks introduced the CHOICE Act, which would authorize voucher programs for disabled students.

   ✓ The CHOICE Act would have redirected more than $11 billion dollars of taxpayer money from public schools to private schools.

   ✓ Disabled students enrolled in programs authorized under the CHOICE Act would forfeit protections that ensure individualized education plans are followed.

✓ 2010: Miller-Meeks said “charter schools and school vouchers will improve the quality of an education and reduce costs to taxpayers.”
Miller-Meeks repeatedly criticized student debt loan forgiveness.

- October 2021: Miller-Meeks said she was concerned that eligibility for public service loan forgiveness was too broad and included jobs that were not actually public service.
- June 2021: Miller-Meeks said student loan debt forgiveness could sway some students to college rather than trade occupations that were needed locally.
- September 2020: Miller-Meeks said she would not support a program that used taxpayer money to pay off student loans.
- September 2021: Miller-Meeks voted against an amendment to direct student lenders to discharge the loan in the event of borrower’s death or disability.
- 2014: Miller-Meeks praised former Governor Terry Branstad’s tuition freeze at Iowa public universities as the “right move.”
- Miller-Meeks introduced a bill to promote school curriculum decrying communism.
- Miller-Meeks voted against blocking consideration of a bill aimed at curtailing the teaching of critical race theory in schools.
- Miller-Meeks voted against blocking the Parents’ Bill of Rights Act and asked why the DOJ was “targeting parents who speak out in opposition to school board decisions.”
- 2021: Miller-Meeks requested $5 million in earmarks for a career counseling program at Indian Hills Community College.
- 2010: Miller-Meeks said she supported reforming No Child Left Behind.
- Miller-Meeks: “the Department of Education at the federal level plays an oversized role in education.”

COVID-19 In Schools

Miller-Meeks Falsely Claimed Children Do Not Transmit COVID-19 And That Requiring Masks In School Was “Not Following The Science”

Miller-Meeks Claimed Elementary Age Students “Don’t Transmit [COVID-19] To Adults Or Other Children”

Miller-Meeks Claimed Elementary Age Students “Don’t Transmit [COVID-19] To Adults Or Other Children.” “Been saying this since last summer. Teachers can be protected. Elementary age students rarely die or are seriously ill and don’t transmit virus to adults or other children. Global poverty has exploded also and will take decades to reverse.” QUOTE TWEET @UNICEF: “To prevent the COVID-19 pandemic from having a life-long impact on an entire generation of children and young people - especially the most vulnerable, governments must reopen schools and recover lost learning.” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 7/17/21]

Miller-Meeks: “We Have Known For Over A Year That Children Don’t Transmit The Virus.” MACDONALD: “Major push back now against Dr. Fauci. He says children age 2 or older should wear masks, but the WHO says children under age 5 don’t need to wear masks. There’s a lot of confusion about this. What do you say to this?” MILLER-MEEKS: “It’s the same reason why there’s vaccine hesitancy and that’s because we
continue to get mixed messages from the so-called experts. So, the WHO has said children under 5 don’t need to wear masks. Even as far back as almost a year ago, the American Journal of Pediatrics had published that children don’t transmit. So, children up to the elementary school age, so that would be up until 6th grade, don’t transmit the virus to other children or to adults. Children get the virus from other adults, but they weren’t transmitting it. And that may be because they have a better immune system and a better T-cell immune system, but nonetheless, we have known for over a year that children don’t transmit the virus.” [Fox Business, 7/14/21] (VIDEO) 00:00:57

Miller-Meeks: “To Say We’re Not Going To Let Children Go Back To School Unless They’re Wearing Masks Is Not Following The Science”

Miller-Meeks: “To Say We’re Not Going To Let Children Go Back To School Unless They’re Wearing Masks Is Not Following The Science.” “We have known for over a year that children don’t transmit the virus. So delaying children going to summer camps, being outdoors where there’s almost infinitesimally low transmission, it seems absurd to have children wearing masks when they’re outdoors playing in sports and certainly in the elementary age group. I think to say we’re not going to let children go back to school unless they’re wearing masks is not following the science.” [Fox Business, 7/14/21] (VIDEO) 00:01:50

Miller-Meeks’ Claims That Children Do Not Transmit COVID-19 Were Debunked By Local Fact Checkers And Opinion Writers

Cedar Rapids Gazette Fact Check: Miller-Meeks’ Claim That Children Do Not Transmit COVID-19 Was “Inaccurate” And “Contradicts New CDC Recommendations.” “Miller-Meeks, an ophthalmologist, has been a vocal advocate for Iowans to get the COVID-19 vaccine. But her claims about children not transmitting the virus are inaccurate. Kids can and do pass the virus, although at much lower rates than adults. If Miller-Meeks had qualified her statement even a little, saying children usually don’t transmit the virus, she’d be correct. But she didn’t. And she uses the claim as a reason for saying children don’t need to wear masks in school — a conclusion that contradicts new CDC recommendations. Her statement that ‘elementary age students rarely die or are seriously ill’ is true, which saves her overall grade from an F. Instead, we give her a D.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 8/2/21]

Ottumwa Courier Editorial: Miller-Meeks’ Statement That Children Do Not Transmit COVID-19 Was “Patently False.” “In July, she tweeted that children ‘don’t transmit virus to adults or other children.’ She appeared on a Fox Business show with a similar message. We know that statement is patently false. Last week, children accounted for a third of new cases in Iowa.” [Ottumwa Courier, Editorial, 9/14/21]

Cedar Rapids Gazette’s Todd Dorman: “Despite U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks Recent False Claims To The Contrary, Children Can Transmit The Virus, Potentially To Vulnerable Adults At Home.” “A troubling number of cases among children are being recorded in regions where the delta variant is running wild. From the end of July to Aug. 6, the CDC reported an average of 216 children hospitalized daily. And despite U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks recent false claims to the contrary, children can transmit the virus, potentially to vulnerable adults at home.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, Todd Dorman, 8/12/21]

September 2021: Miller-Meeks Joined A Letter Calling On The CDC To Publicly Lay Out The Science Behind Their Decision To Recommend Children Wear Masks In School

Miller-Meeks Joined A Letter With 31 House Republicans Calling On The CDC To Publicly Lay Out The Science Behind Their Decision To Recommend Children Wear Masks In School. “U.S. Congressman Jay Obernolte (CA-08) and 32 members of the U.S. House of Representatives have called on Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) Director Rochelle Walensky to publicly lay out the science behind their decision to recommend children wear masks in school. ‘We have been repeatedly told to trust the science regarding how the CDC creates its policies, yet the lack of transparency in how this recommendation was made and the absence of studies to support it is both concerning and extremely frustrating to parents of school-aged children. Therefore, as schools are set to reopen under strict and tenuously justified mask mandates based on CDC recommendations, we
July 2021: Miller-Meeks Said “All Schools Need To Be Open For In Person Learning This Fall” And Shared An Article About CDC Guidance On Masks For Fully Vaccinated Students And Teachers. “Finally, and yes all schools need to be open for in person learning this fall: Fully Vaccinated Students, Teachers Don't Need Masks: CDC. LINK: Buzzfeed News: In A Bid To Reopen Schools, The CDC Said Fully Vaccinated Students And Teachers Don't Need Masks.” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 7/9/21]

February 2021: Miller-Meeks Called For The United States To “Listen To The Scientists And Reopen Our Schools Immediately.” We should never allow teachers unions or any other entity to make unscientific decisions that affect the health and well-being of our children. We must listen to the scientists and reopen our schools immediately. [Washington Times, Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Brad Wenstrup, Andy Harris, and Michael Burgess Op-Ed, 2/9/21]

February 2021: Miller-Meeks Said “The New CDC Guidance Repeats What I Have Said For Months, It Is Beyond Time To Follow The Science And Reopen Our Schools.” “Today, February 12th, 2021, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02), released the following statement on the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) issuing guidance to have students safely return to in-person learning as soon as possible: ‘The new CDC guidance repeats what I have said for months, it is beyond time to follow the science and reopen our schools. I hope the Biden Administration keeps to its promises to listen to science. Our children are falling behind socially, academically, and their mental health is declining. For our children, we must act quickly.’ Earlier this week, Miller-Meeks, a veteran, physician, and former President of the Iowa Medical Society, penned an op-ed in The Washington Times with her fellow Doctors Caucus members, Reps. Brad Wenstrup (OH-02), Michael Burgess (TX-26), and Andy Harris (MD-01), on the importance of following the science and reopening schools.” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 2/12/21]

Miller-Meeks Blamed The American Federation Of Teachers (AFT) For COVID-19 School Closures And Said AFT “Was Providing Verbatim Edits To Scientific And Medical Guidance”

Miller-Meeks: “The Democrats And The Teachers’ Union Kept Schools Closed.” “MILLER-MEEKS: The Democrats and the teachers' union kept schools closed. And now, not only has a generation of young children been robbed of a year of education, but mental health problems are up 31 percent, drug use and addiction resulting in overdose have exploded, and children as young as nine have committed suicide, all traced back to the shuttering of schools. Now we know who is responsible, the teachers' union. Union involvement in the drafting and editing of scientific guidance is the very definition of political meddling. It is unclear how many children were locked out of school because of the union's selfishness. And even today, summer camps don't have guidance from the CDC on reopening without masks. Do they need to hire the AFT? The lives of American children must be governed by medical science and not political science.” [CQ, 5/19/21]

Miller-Meeks Claimed That The American Federation Of Teachers (AFT) “Is Providing Verbatim Edits To Scientific And Medical Guidance At The CDC's Request.” “MILLER-MEEKS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. On May 11th, committee Republicans sent a letter to the CDC about the apparent influence of the American Federation of Teachers on official government documents. We have yet to receive a response. The AFT is not a medical group. It is not a scientific group. Yet it is providing verbatim edits to scientific and meddle—medical guidance at the CDC's request. Chairman Clyburn and the House Democrats spent the better part of a year investigating alleged influence
at the CDC but remain silent on these egregious reports. This is influenced by political operatives that are both unelected and unaffiliated with the federal government. As one of the two medical experts on this committee, this is appalling. President Biden pr--promised his administration would follow science and truth. Director Walensky said the guidance was free from medical meddling. A paper trail shows this to be patently false. Biden's secretary of Education said 'in-person learning offers our young people the best opportunity.' Why not listen to him?” [CQ, 5/19/21]

- Select Committee Republicans Tweeted That Miller-Meeks “Blasted The Biden Administration And The @CDCgov For Allowing The American Federation Of Teachers To Meddle In And Draft Scientific Guidance Regarding Reopening Schools.” “Today, @RepMMM blasted the Biden Administration and the @CDCgov for allowing the American Federation of Teachers to meddle in and draft scientific guidance regarding reopening schools. America's classrooms should be governed by medical science.” [Twitter, @SelectGOP, 5/19/21] (VIDEO)

May 2021: Miller-Meeks Wrote A Letter To CDC Director Dr. Rochelle Walensky Condemning The Agency’s Consulting The American Federation Of Teachers While Developing School Reopening Guidelines. “Today, May 6th, 2021, Reps. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02) and Greg Murphy (NC-03), both doctors and members of the House Veterans’ Affairs and Education & Labor Committees, wrote a letter to Dr. Rochelle Walensky, Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, demanding more information regarding the American Federation of Teachers’ influence on school reopening guidelines: ‘The New York Post recently reported on the outsized influence teachers’ unions had over the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) when the agency was developing updated school reopening guidance in February. This report is alarming considering the significant national outcry from parents to follow the well-established science and get schools reopened.’ The Members continued: ‘It is imperative the CDC rise above politics and focus on the science, including studying virus transmission and the academic well-being and mental and physical health of students. Failing to put students first is a breach of responsibility.’” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 5/6/21]

Miller-Meeks Joined Fellow Republicans To Launch “A Probe Into Improper Outside Influence” On CDC School Reopening Guidelines By The American Federation Of Teachers (AFT)

May 2021: Miller-Meeks Joined Fellow Republicans To Launch “A Probe Into Improper Outside Influence” On CDC School Reopening Guidelines By The American Federation Of Teachers (AFT). “Today, May 11th, 2021, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02) joined members of the Select Subcommittee on the Coronavirus Crisis and the House Committee on Oversight and Reform in launching a probe into improper outside influence on the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) school reopening guidance by the American Federation of Teachers (AFT). ‘President Biden failed America’s children when he bowed down to the bosses at the AFT rather than following the science and standing up for what is best for young students. The lives and education of America’s children must be governed by medical science, not political science,’ wrote the Republican lawmakers in a letter to CDC Director Dr. Rochelle Walensky. On February 12, 2021, the CDC released the Operational Strategy for reopening schools. According to emails obtained by Americans for Public Trust, the AFT was provided a pre-release copy of the CDC’s school reopening guidance and successfully lobbied the CDC to change its final guidance that advised keeping more than 90 percent of schools closed. Currently, less than 50 percent of schools are fully reopened, despite experts saying there is no medical reason students cannot return to in-person learning. The Republican lawmakers concluded, ‘The AFT was able to successfully bully the public health
experts at the CDC into politicizing the guidance … It is unclear how many children were locked out of classrooms and negatively impacted by this disturbing change.’ As part of their probe, the Republican lawmakers call on Dr. Walensky to provide all documents, communications, and information related to the Operational Strategy, including those from the AFT, by May 25, 2021, as well as a briefing no later than May 18, 2021.” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 5/11/21]

### Miller-Meeks: “While Democrats Call For Billions In New Funding To Help Schools Reopen, There Are Still Billions In Unspent Funding For Educational Services From The Previous COVID-19 Relief Packages”

“First, children are not at great risk for severe illness or death from COVID-19. Second, while Democrats call for billions in new funding to help schools reopen, there are still billions in unspent funding for educational services from the previous COVID-19 relief packages, according to the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget. Congress most recently provided an additional $82 billion for the Education Stabilization Fund in the December relief package. Third, and most critical to getting students and teachers back in the classroom, CDC Director Dr. Rochelle Wolensky stated just this past week that the data — the science — supports the notion that schools can reopen even without teacher vaccinations.” [Washington Times, Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Brad Wenstrup, Andy Harris, and Michael Burgess Op-Ed, 2/9/21]

### Miller-Meeks Attributed “The Rate Of Depression, Mental Health Issues And Suicide Among Students As Young As Nine Years Old” To Schools Moving Online During COVID-19

“MILLER-MEEKS: My time is limited but speaking of the pandemic and I would say that we spend more per student than almost any other country and have mixed results but Dr. Murphy and I on Ed and Labor together sent a letter on May 6 to Dr. Walensky the Director of the CDC raising concerns about reports that teachers unions inappropriately exerted political pressure on the Biden administration to influence CDC health guidelines on reopening schools. The reason this is important is because in closing schools the rate of depression, mental health issues and suicide among students as young as nine years old have escalated, 31 percent increase in mental health issues. Do you agree it's inappropriate for teachers unions to exert political pressure on health officials and do you agree that health decisions should instead be based on the evidence?” [CQ, 6/24/21]

Miller-Meeks Cited An Increase In Clark County, Nevada Student Suicides As “A Glaring Example Of The Serious Mental Anguish Children Are Enduring” From Doing School From Home. “The data is clear. Unfortunately, some of our nation’s public schools are failing our children. Virtual learning yields subpar results, and many students are falling further behind, especially those in low-income and underprivileged communities. Additionally, Clark County, Nevada, serves as a glaring example of the serious mental anguish children are enduring, as they have already had double the number of student suicides compared to last year. Unfortunately, the detrimental effects of keeping kids home are great, which is why the American Academy of Pediatrics has stressed the importance of students returning to in-person learning.” [Washington Times, Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Brad Wenstrup, Andy Harris, and Michael Burgess Op-Ed, 2/9/21]

### Miller-Meeks Said COVID-19 Helped Control The Costs Of Education By Having All Classes Online

Miller-Meeks Said COVID-19 Helped Control The Costs Of Education By Having All Classes Online. At a Johnson County GOP Candidate Forum Miller-Meeks, when asked for ways to control cost of higher education, said “Well I think one of the things that can control the cost of higher education is what we just seen happen through COVID-19 in the pandemic. And that is classes were cancelled for many people and they were done
online. So having online education, having more support of our community colleges which help with both trades and apprenticeships, a skillset before going to a four-year institution will help to reduce the cost of a college education.” [Johnson County GOP Candidate Forum, 00:09:30, 4/24/20] (VIDEO)

**Education Jobs And Medicaid Assistance Act Of 2010**

**Miller-Meeks Opposed The Education Jobs And Medicaid Assistance Act Of 2010, Which Was Expected To Save 140,000 Teachers’ Jobs, Because It Closed A Tax Loophole For Corporations That Outsource Jobs**

Cedar Rapids Gazette: Miller-Meeks Said She Would Have Opposed The Education Jobs And Medicaid Assistance Act Of 2010 “Because The Measures Were Funded, In Part, With $9.8 Billion Saved By Restricting Ways Multinational Companies Could Claim The Foreign Tax Credit.” “U.S. Rep. Dave Loebsack, a Democrat, criticized Republican Mariannette Miller-Meeks for favoring ‘tax breaks to outsourcing corporations.’ Miller-Meeks told KCRG-TV9 she would have opposed the Education Jobs and Medicaid Assistance Act of 2010 because the measures were funded, in part, with $9.8 billion saved by restricting ways multinational companies could claim the foreign tax credit. Closing a loophole to Democrats was considered raising taxes to Republicans, but we scored Loebsack’s claim mostly true.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 10/4/14]

• **Cedar Rapids Gazette Fact Check Called Loebsack’s Claim “Mostly True” That Miller-Meeks Opposed A Bill To Fund Schools And Keep Teachers Employed Because She Objected To Closing A Tax Loophole For “Outsourcing Corporations.”** “U.S. Rep. Dave Loebsack, a Democrat, criticized Republican Mariannette Miller-Meeks for favoring ‘tax breaks to outsourcing corporations.’ Miller-Meeks told KCRG-TV9 she would have opposed the Education Jobs and Medicaid Assistance Act of 2010 because the measures were funded, in part, with $9.8 billion saved by restricting ways multinational companies could claim the foreign tax credit. Closing a loophole to Democrats was considered raising taxes to Republicans, but we scored Loebsack’s claim mostly true.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 10/4/14]

• **Miller-Meeks Called The Congressional Bill, Which Helped States Pay For Education Expenses And Medicaid, “A Double Shot To Iowa.”** “The U.S. House of Representatives has been in August recess, but it’s scheduled to be back in session today to vote on a $26 billion spending bill that the Senate approved last week. The money has two purposes - to help states pay for education expenses, and to help pay for Medicaid, the state-federal government health insurance program for the poor. […] Mariannette Miller-Meeks, R-Ottumwa ‘This bill is a double shot to Iowa. It takes $12 billion from food stamps to put money into an education system that needs to be reformed. Experts like the Iowa Policy Project say the food stamp program is the greatest government-funded stimulus for Iowa because every $1 million spent in the program generates or saves 10 Iowa jobs. Is David Loebsack honestly going to vote to take food from Americans who are at their most vulnerable and cost Iowans more jobs just to pay for the Democrats’ election-year grandstanding?’” [Des Moines Register, 8/10/10]

• **The Bill Included $26 Billion In Federal Funds To Shore Up State Budgets And Was Expected To Save 290,000 Jobs, Including 140,000 Teachers’ Positions.** “Cash-strapped states are getting $26 billion in federal funds to shore up their budgets. The House voted 247-161 Tuesday, with support from the Democrats and overwhelming rejection from the Republicans, to send $16.1 billion in additional Medicaid money and $10 billion to prevent layoffs of teachers and first responders. In an unusual move, representatives returned from their August recess to approve the measure. […] The bill is expected to save 290,000 jobs, including 140,000 teachers' positions, according to congressional Democrats.” [CNN, 8/11/10]

**School Choice – Vouchers And Charters**

**2021: Miller-Meeks Introduced The CHOICE Act, Which Would Authorize Voucher Programs For**
Disabled Students To Attend Private Schools

**November 2021: Miller-Meeks Introduced The Creating Hope And Opportunity For Individuals And Communities Through Education (CHOICE) Act.** In November 2021, Miller-Meeks introduced HR 5959, a bill that “authorizes the Department of Education (ED) to award grants to support the design and implementation of state programs that allow the parent of a child with a disability to choose the appropriate public or private school for their child. It also outlines the requirements for program eligibility. Further, if the state has established a program that allows parents to use public or private funds to assist with the cost of their child attending a private school, then the state may supplement those funds with federal special education funds. Additionally, the Department of Defense must carry out a five-year pilot program to award scholarships to enable military dependent students who live on military installations to attend the public or private elementary or secondary schools their parents choose. The bill also requires ED to return to the Treasury specified amounts made available for salaries and expenses.” As of December 8, 2021, the bill had been referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services. [HR 5959, Sponsored, 11/12/21; CQ, 11/12/21]

- **The CHOICE Act Authorized Grants For Programs That Allow The Parent Of A Child With A Disability To Choose A Public Or Private School For Their Child.** In November 2021, Miller-Meeks introduced HR 5959, a bill that “authorizes the Department of Education (ED) to award grants to support the design and implementation of state programs that allow the parent of a child with a disability to choose the appropriate public or private school for their child. It also outlines the requirements for program eligibility. Further, if the state has established a program that allows parents to use public or private funds to assist with the cost of their child attending a private school, then the state may supplement those funds with federal special education funds. […] The bill also requires ED to return to the Treasury specified amounts made available for salaries and expenses.” As of December 8, 2021, the bill had been referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services. [HR 5959, Sponsored, 11/12/21; CQ, 11/12/21]

- **Miller-Meeks: “The CHOICE Act Will Give Families More Options To Give Their Children The Best Education Possible.”** “‘I left home to go to college at the age of sixteen to pursue the best educational opportunities available. The last year has shown us that students need to have the opportunity to succeed no matter where they live,’ said Miller-Meeks. ‘The CHOICE Act will give families more options to give their children the best education possible. Senator Scott has always been a leading voice in fighting for equal access to quality education and I am proud to join him in this commonsense legislation.’ ‘As the product of a poor, single-parent household, I have always been a champion of school choice. And as the coronavirus pandemic has shown us, the need for educational options is more vital today than ever before,’ said Scott. ‘The sad reality is too many students lack access to a quality education because of their zip code, and that is simply unacceptable. Commonsense solutions like my CHOICE Act will empower families to choose the best schools for their children and put parents in charge.’” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 11/9/21]

The CHOICE Act Would Have Redirected More Than $11 Billion Dollars Of Taxpayer Money From Public To Private Schools

**National Coalition For Public Education: “The CHOICE Act Would Funnel More Than $11 Billion Dollars Of Taxpayer Money To Private Schools.”** “The CHOICE Act would funnel more than $11 billion dollars of taxpayer money to private schools. It would turn IDEA into a voucher, reduce Impact Aid, and expand the failing DC voucher program, all the while, stripping vital civil rights protections and basic accountability standards. Instead, Congress should invest these dollars in the public schools, which serve all students regardless of gender, disability, economic status, or educational achievement.” [National Coalition For Public Education, accessed 12/8/21]

The CHOICE Act Would Have Undermined Efforts To Include Disabled Students In Public Schools

National Coalition For Public Education: The CHOICE Act Would Have Undermined Efforts To Include Disabled Students In Public Schools. “This bill would allow the states to use IDEA funds for private school vouchers, undermining the core Principles behind idea and stripping students of important rights. One goal of IDEA is to bring students with disabilities into the public school system, provide them access to the general education curriculum, and protect against the history of exclusion of students with disabilities from public schools. Vouchers, in contrast, place students in private schools that do not have to follow the same inclusionary practices as public schools, allowing students with disabilities to be isolated from their nondisabled peers. With the Ohio autism voucher, for example, fully 75% of claims for vouchers were for use at providers ‘created to primarily or exclusively serve disabled students.’” [National Coalition For Public Education, accessed 12/8/21]

Miller-Meeks Touted Her Endorsement By Tim Scott, Calling Him “A Champion For School Choice”

Miller-Meeks: “Senator Scott Has Been A Champion For School Choice And I Look Forward Working With Him To Give Parents More Options In Their Children's Education.” “Thank you @SenatorTimScott for your endorsement for my re-election campaign! Senator Scott has been a champion for School Choice and I look forward working with him to give parents more options in their children's education. #IA01” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 11/17/21]

2010: Miller-Meeks Said “Charter Schools And School Vouchers Will Improve The Quality Of An Education And Reduce Costs To Taxpayers”

Miller-Meeks: “Charter Schools And School Vouchers Will Improve The Quality Of An Education And Reduce Costs To Taxpayers.” According to Miller-Meeks for Congress 2010 website under “Improving Education”, Miller-Meeks said “I believe the answer is competition in education. Charter schools and school vouchers will improve the quality of an education and reduce costs to taxpayers. Increased accountability and merit pay based on classroom performance (rather than standardized tests) will reward our best public school teachers and raise classroom performance. I also firmly support parental rights, and those who choose to home-school their children.” [Miller-Meeks for Congress 2010, accessed 6/15/20]

College Affordability

Miller-Meeks Repeatedly Criticized Student Debt Loan Forgiveness

October 2021: Miller-Meeks Said She Was Concerned That Eligibility For Public Service Loan Forgiveness Was Too Broad And Included Jobs That Were Not Actually Public Service

Miller-Meeks Said She Was Concerned That Eligibility For Public Service Loan Forgiveness Was Too Broad And Included Jobs That Were Not Actually Public Service. MILLER-MEEKS: “I am not against public service, obviously, and I am not against the PSLF. But I am concerned that the eligibility for the program is so vast and so broad that we are using a program intended to incentivize public service on industries and jobs that ultimately do not fit that definition.” [YouTube, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 10/27/21] (VIDEO) 00:03:45

June 2021: Miller-Meeks Said One Of The Problems With Student Loan Debt Forgiveness Was That It Could Sway Some Students To College Rather Than Trade Occupations

Miller-Meeks Said One Of The Problems With Student Loan Debt Forgiveness Was That It Could Sway Some Students To College Rather Than Trade Occupations. “Miller-Meeks said this was a perfect example of why economic development and training needs to be executed locally rather than on the federal level. ‘Too often,
unless we talk to business representatives, we don’t know what skills are needed or what you are lacking,” she said. She added that one of the problems she has with the Biden Administration’s push to forgive student loan debt is that it may further sway some to college rather than have them consider trade occupations that are needed in the area.” [Fort Madison Daily Democrat, 6/4/21]

September 2020: Miller-Meeks Said She Would Not Support A Program That Used Taxpayer Money To Pay Off Student Loans

September 2020: Miller-Meeks Said She Would Not Support A Program That Used Taxpayer Money To Pay Off Student Loans. “Undergraduate loan debt: Both candidates said more needed to be done to educate students about the long-term financial obligations created through student loans. Hart said the government should work to lower the interest rates tied to students loans. Miller-Meeks said she wouldn't support a program that used taxpayer money to pay off student loans.” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 9/28/20]

September 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against An Amendment To Direct The Holder Of A Private Education Loan To Discharge Loan In The Event Of Borrower’s Death Or Disability

September 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against An Amendment To Direct The Holder Of A Private Education Loan To Discharge Loan In The Event Of Borrower’s Death Or Disability. On September 22, 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against the “Dean, D-Pa., amendment no. 5 that would direct the holder of a private education loan to discharge the loan in the event of the borrower's death or total and permanent disability.” The amendment was adopted 219 to 204. [CQ, 9/22/21; H.R. 4350, Vote 269, 9/22/21]

2014: Miller-Meeks Praised Former Governor Terry Branstad’s Tuition Freeze At Iowa Public Universities Was The “Right Move”

2014: Miller-Meeks Praised Former Governor Terry Branstad’s Tuition Freeze At Iowa Public Universities Was The “Right Move.” According to Miller-Meeks for Congress 2014 website under “Student Centered Education”, Miller-Meeks said “we have the best colleges and universities in the world, but the cost of higher education is out of control. Iowa students have some of the highest amounts of debt in the country. Governor Terry Branstad’s tuition freeze at Iowa public universities was the right move to lessen our students’ burden when they graduate. Schools should adopt accelerated programs and work closely with businesses to ensure curriculum is current and students are gaining real-world experience.” [Miller-Meeks for Congress 2014, accessed 6/15/20]

Curriculum

Miller-Meeks Introduced A Bill To Promote School Curriculum Decrying Communism

Miller-Meeks Introduced A Bill That Would Promote School Curriculum Decrying Communism. “Iowa U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks joined a group of House Republicans to introduce a bill that would promote school curriculum decrying communism. ‘(I)n our school system we talk eloquently about the excesses and the demerits of capitalism, but we never talk about the excesses, the brutality and the murder of communist regimes and why they have continued to fail,’ Miller-Meeks said at a press conference on Capitol Hill Thursday announcing the bill. ‘And if we're going to have critical thinking in our young adults and in our citizens, then they have to be taught both points of view,’ she continued. ‘We must ensure that our next generation is well-educated in the dangers of this radical ideology.’” [Quad-City Times, 12/2/21]

- Miller-Meeks: “In Our School System We Talk Eloquenty About The Excesses And The Demerits Of Capitalism, But We Never Talk About The Excesses, The Brutality And The Murder Of Communist Regimes.” “Iowa U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks joined a group of House Republicans to introduce a bill that would promote school curriculum decrying communism. ‘(I)n our school system we talk eloquently abut
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[sic] the excesses and the demerits of capitalism, but we never talk about the excesses, the brutality and the murder of communist regimes and why they have continued to fail,’ Miller-Meeks said at a press conference on Capitol Hill Thursday announcing the bill. ‘And if we're going to have critical thinking in our young adults and in our citizens, then they have to be taught both points of view,’ she continued. ‘We must ensure that our next generation is well-educated in the dangers of this radical ideology.’” [Quad-City Times, 12/2/21]

- **Iowa State Education Association’s Jean Hessburg: Miller-Meeks’ Bill To Promote School Curriculum Decrying Communism Was “Out Of Whack With What Is Important Right Now” Because “We Have A Rich History Of Great Curriculum In Iowa.”** ‘Iowa U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks joined a group of House Republicans to introduce a bill that would promote school curriculum decrying communism. […] ‘We have a rich history of great curriculum in Iowa, which is supported by professionals who work in the field,’ said Jean Hessburg, spokesperson for the Iowa State Education Association. ‘Her proposal seems out of whack with what is important right now,’ Hessbrug [sic] said. ‘The health and safety of our students, continuing to teach the rich curriculum that is offered in our schools, and ensuring that our kids have the right books and materials and that classrooms aren't overcrowded’ should be the focus.” [Quad-City Times, 12/2/21]

Miller-Meeks Voted Against Blocking Consideration Of A Bill Aimed At Curtailing The Teaching Of Critical Race Theory In Schools

Miller-Meeks Voted Against Blocking Consideration Of A Bill Aimed At Curtailing The Teaching Of Critical Race Theory In Schools. In July 2021, voted against: “McGovern, D-Mass., motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and possibility of amendment). According to the Congressional Record, Rep. Cole said, ‘if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 4698 for immediate consideration. This bill addresses the growing problem in American schools of educators pushing their own ideology onto students by forcing them to use the pedagogy of critical race theory.” A vote for the motion was a block consideration of the bill. The motion was agreed to 217 to 201. [HR 555, Vote #222, 7/27/21; CQ, 7/27/21; Congressional Record, 7/27/21]

Earmarks

2021: Miller-Meeks Requested $5 Million In Earmarks For A Career Counseling Program At Indian Hills Community College

2021: Miller-Meeks Requested $5 Million For A Career Counseling Program At Indian Hills Community College. “After a 10-year ban on congressional earmarks, Iowa’s U.S. House members are seeking more than $51 million for projects ranging from expanding child care centers to replacing a fire station in rural north Iowa to modernizing Mississippi River locks and dams. […] In the 2nd District, Republican Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks has requested $14.15 million, including $600,000 for a bridge replacement in Scott County, $5 million for an Indian Hills Community College career counseling program and $750,000 to complete the design phase for a new Iowa City transit operations and maintenance facility.” [Daily Nonpareil, 8/13/21]

Funding

2020: Miller-Meeks Said “When I Hear That There’s Not Fully Funding Schools, I Don’t Know What Fully Funding Schools Means” In Response To A Question About Iowa State Supplemental Aid Allocations

2020: Miller-Meeks Said “When I Hear That There’s Not Fully Funding Schools, I Don’t Know What Fully Funding Schools Means” In Response To A Question About Iowa State Supplemental Aid Allocations. “During a Feb. 15 legislative forum in Fairfield, state Sen. Mariannette Miller-Meeks was asked what she felt was an appropriate allocation of State Supplemental Aid — the amount of new money given to Iowa’s public schools.
Miller-Meeks, who represents District 41 in southeast Iowa and is running for Congress this year, began by pointing to the $90 million distributed in new money last year, in addition to the separate dollars set aside to help school districts offset high transportation costs. ‘… when I hear that there’s not fully funding schools, I don’t know what fully funding schools means,’ Miller-Meeks said, at Boarders Inn & Suites. ‘When you look at those dollar amounts, it’s the highest part of our budget.’” [Iowa Starting Line, 2/25/20]

### No Child Left Behind

#### 2010: Miller-Meeks Said She Supported Reforming No Child Left Behind

2010: Miller-Meeks Said She Supported Reforming No Child Left Behind Because “The Needs Of Every Student Differ.” According to Miller-Meeks for Congress 2010 website under “Generally, education reform must emphasize more local control, less administrative bureaucracy, and allowing teachers to teach, innovate and excel in their own classrooms. The needs of every student differ, and therefore the needs are different from classroom to classroom. That also means reforming No Child Left Behind to prevent ‘teaching to the test’ and allowing more freedom for teachers to teach.” [Miller-Meeks for Congress 2010, accessed 6/15/20]

### State And Local Control

#### Miller-Meeks Said States Should Be Able To Run Their Own Education Systems

2021: Miller-Meeks Said “States Themselves Should Be Able To Run Their Education Systems In A Way That Makes The Most Sense For That State.” “MILLER-MEEKS: I also left home at 16 and started in community college, so my question is about community colleges. I think that they’re indispensable in their local communities, and they provide education at lower cost than four-year institutions. I support each student being able to choose the best postsecondary path for them to reach both their academic and their career goals. I also believe states themselves should be able to run their education systems in a way that makes the most sense for that state. But President Biden would have us believe that mandating that community colleges be free is in fact the answer to the complex problems for both access and affordability in higher education for all students. We have great community colleges in my home state of Iowa and in my district, but nationwide community colleges still face a number of challenges like long wait lists, low graduation rates, and low transfer rates to four-year institutions. Mr. Secretary, do you believe that community college in every state, all community colleges, are equipped to handle the expected influx of students attending on the promise of a free college education? And will they be able to effectively meet all the students' needs? If not, how can you justify the president's budget request to spend over $100 billion to make community college free for all?” [CQ, 6/24/21]

2020: Miller-Meeks Said Education Should Be Left To States To Manage. “Scheinblum asked the candidates what agency or governmental department they would reform or eliminate, if elected. […] Miller-Meeks also said education should be left to states to manage. She said the Departments of Energy and Homeland Security could be reduced.” [Muscatine Journal, 7/2/20]

#### Miller-Meeks Voted Against Blocking The Parents Bill Of Rights Act And Asked Why The DOJ Was “Targeting Parents Who Speak Out In Opposition To School Board Decisions”

Dec. 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Blocking Consideration Of The Parents Bill Of Rights Act To Increase Transparency And Parental Involvement In Education. On December 2, 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against “Agreeing to the Torres, D-Calif., motion to order the previous question (thus limiting debate and possibility of amendment) on the rule (H Res 829) that would provide for House floor consideration of the fiscal 2022 further continuing resolution (HR 6119).” According to the Congressional Record, Rep. Cole said, “If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment on the rule to immediately bring up H.R. 6056, the Parents Bill of Rights Act.” A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of the bill. The motion was agreed to
by a vote of 218-209. [H. Res. 829, Vote 395, 12/2/21; CQ, 12/2/21; Congressional Record, 12/2/21]


Miller-Meeks: “The Department Of Education At The Federal Level Plays An Oversized Role In Education.” At a Muscatine County GOP Forum, Miller-Meeks was asked “What agencies can we cut from the government to rein in spending and provide better oversight? Or how would you gain better oversight into our many government agencies for better public transparency?” Miller-Meeks responded “Well, certainly, Department of Education, the role of education should be through the state. So the Department of Education at the federal level plays an oversized role in education. And so looking at reducing and by attrition, i.e. when someone retires or don’t hire somebody to fill that position are ways that you can start reducing. […] And so looking at how our funding is what the sources sunsetting of laws and then not having automatic 2% increases in the budget year after year, but looking at the budget, just because you don’t if you don’t raise the funding to an agency doesn’t mean you’re cutting, cutting their budget. or cutting spending. So I don’t agree with automatic raises any of the agencies. [Muscatine County GOP Forum, 00:42:06, 5/26/20] (VIDEO)

Miller-Meeks Voted To Remove Student Health Screening Reporting Requirements In Iowa Schools

2019: Miller-Meeks Voted For SF 438, A Bill That Related To School District Responsibilities. Miller-Meeks voted for SF 438, “A bill for an act relating to the responsibilities and authority of school districts or school corporations, accredited nonpublic schools, area education agencies, community colleges, and board of regents institutions, and including effective date provisions.” The bill passed 32-17. [Iowa State Legislature, SF 438, 3/20/19]

- SF 438 Would Remove Student Health Screening Reporting Requirements In Iowa Schools. “Division I makes the following changes: Eliminates a requirement that school districts, community colleges, and institutions under the control of the Board of Regents purchase specified cleaning products. Eliminates a requirement that school districts furnish a list of enrolled kindergarten students to the Iowa Department of Public Health (IDPH). School districts would no longer be required to collect dental screening, vision screening, or blood lead testing data from students. Providers of the vision screenings, dental screenings, and blood lead testing would be required to provide information to the IDPH. Upon request of a school district, with parental or guardian consent, IDPH would provide a list of children enrolled in that district who have had dental screenings, vision screenings, and blood lead testing.” [Iowa State Legislature, SF 438 Fiscal Note, 3/22/19]

Vocational And Technical Schools

2010: Miller-Meeks Said She Supported “Bolstering These Areas That Help With Certain Skills, Training And Technical Courses Which Are Vital To Our Economy”

Miller-Meeks Said She Supported “Bolstering These Areas That Help With Certain Skills, Training And Technical Courses Which Are Vital To Our Economy.” According to Miller-Meeks for Congress 2010 website
under “Improving Education”, Miller-Meeks said “an affordable college education isn’t just about low-interest rates on government backed loans, since it does not bring down the cost of a higher education. As someone who went through the community college system, I fully support bolstering these areas that help with certain skills, training and technical courses which are vital to our economy and provide good-paying jobs for middle class Iowa families. [Miller-Meeks for Congress 2010, accessed 6/15/20]

**Campus Free Speech**

**2019: Miller-Meeks Voted For The Campus Free Speech Act In The Iowa Senate**


- **Iowa Public Radio: The Campus Free Speech Bill Passed Despite “Concerns That It Would Open The Door To Discrimination In Student Organizations.”** “A bill that aims to expand free speech rights on public college campuses in Iowa passed the House and Senate this week in spite of concerns that it would open the door to discrimination in student organizations. The House of Representatives debated the measure Thursday. Hite (Rep. Dustin Hite, R-New Sharon) said the bill requires public colleges to promote free expression, avoid trying to protect students from others’ speech, and get rid of ‘free speech zones’ he said unreasonably limit public expression to a few areas on campus. Several House Democrats said they agree with most of the bill, but they said one section could allow discrimination. It says colleges cannot deny benefits to student groups that require their leaders to ‘agree to and support’ the group’s beliefs...Sen. Zach Wahls, D-Coralville, said it could lead to some people being denied leadership opportunities on campus. ‘This is nothing about a person’s religious beliefs. This is a question about people who have an identity or belong to a group that has historically been marginalized,’ Wahls said. ‘Those students are being denied because of who they are. That’s what discrimination is.’ [Iowa Public Radio, 3/14/19; Iowa State Legislature, S.F. 274, Journal of the Senate, 3/11/19]
### Significant Findings

- Miller-Meeks voted against the For The People Act and the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act, then called a January 2022 bill that combined both initiatives a “partisan power grab.”

- Miller-Meeks said she supported Iowa’s tighter absentee ballot deadlines and voter ID laws, the latter of which she called “highly supported by the public.”
  - Miller-Meeks said Iowans could trust election results “because of the election law changes we have made in Iowa in the past three years.”

- Miller-Meeks pushed back on claims that changes to Iowa’s election laws shortening early voting and closing polling places would make it harder to vote for some Iowans.

- August 2021: Miller-Meeks signed onto an amicus brief supporting Georgia’s voter suppression bill against a Department of Justice lawsuit.

- June 2020: Miller-Meeks voted to limit the Iowa Secretary of State’s emergency powers in matters including election law and the distribution of absentee ballot request forms.

- April 2020: Miller-Meeks said she had called the Secretary of State’s office to “let them know that we had worked very hard to reduce the amount of time for early voting legislatively.”

- April 2020: Miller-Meeks encouraged Iowans to vote by mail during the pandemic.

- 2019: Miller-Meeks voted to make it more difficult for college students to vote and require polls to close earlier.

- 2021: Miller-Meeks voted against the Protecting Our Democracy Act, a bill strengthening checks on presidential powers.

- 2021: Miller-Meeks voted against protecting election officials from threats related to their service.

- 2021: Miller-Meeks voted against granting voting rights to individuals serving felony sentences.

- 2020: Miller-Meeks voted to require that felons pay restitution and complete parole and probation before regaining the right to vote.

### Voting Rights

#### 2022: Miller-Meeks Called Democratic Election Reform And Voting Rights Bills A “Partisan Power Grab”

Miller-Meeks said Democrats’ Voting Rights Legislation Was “Nothing More Than A Partisan Power Grab.” “U.S. Sen. Joni Ernst, R-Iowa, decried Democrats’ attempt to change the Senate filibuster to help pass elections and voting rights legislation to overcome the 60-vote threshold that’s now required to pass most bills. […] The pair claim Democrats’ proposed election reforms would undermine states’ ability to run elections. ‘Their
legislation would overturn state laws and election procedures like the ones that have been so successful in states like Iowa,’ Miller-Meeks said in a statement. ‘They spent hundreds of thousands of taxpayer dollars on an ill-conceived plan to overturn my election and wasted months of precious time. This is nothing more than a partisan power-grab.’” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 1/11/22]

Miller-Meeks Said Contested Elections Would Be “Much More Frequent” If Democrats Ended The Filibuster And Passed Election Reforms. “Miller-Meeks and Republicans on the Administration Committee accused Hart and the Democrats of executing a brazen power grab to try to steal a House seat, eroding election integrity, and wasting taxpayer time and resources. ‘I think that contested elections will be much more frequent if the House Democrats and the Senate Democrats are successful in ending the filibuster and passing through the election law changes that they want to make,’ Miller-Meeks told Insider in an interview at the Capitol.” [Insider, 1/18/22]

### January 2022: Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Freedom To Vote: John R. Lewis Act

**January 2022: Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Freedom To Vote: John R. Lewis Act.** In January 2022, Miller-Meeks voted against the “Butterfield, D-N.C., motion to concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (HR 5746) with a further House amendment containing an election integrity and voting rights package. Among other provisions related to voter access and election security, the bill would require states to allow online and same-day registration, automatically register eligible voters, allow early voting at least 15 days before election day, carry out a program to track and confirm receipt of all absentee ballots, require voting via paper ballots, and accept certain alternate forms of voter identification. It would establish uniform criteria for states’ congressional redistricting plans to prevent partisan gerrymandering and protect political participation of minority groups. It would prohibit any attempt to prevent an individual from registering to vote, prohibit certain practices related to voter intimidation and harassment of election workers, and prohibit states from restricting the provision of food and nonalcoholic beverages at polling locations. It would make Election Day a federal holiday and include provisions to improve voter access for individuals with disabilities. Among other provisions related to campaign finance, the bill would modify or establish public financing mechanisms for presidential and congressional election campaigns that would match 600% of each contribution of up to $200 for candidates whose campaigns do not accept contributions of more than $1,000 per individual donor and do not use more than $50,000 of the candidate’s personal funds. It would create a public financing voucher pilot program in three states, under which each eligible voter could donate $25 in public funding credit to House candidates. It would expand disclosure requirements for large campaign contributions, require candidates and political committees to report foreign contacts to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and prohibit the creation of corporations to conceal foreign election contributions. Among other provisions to strengthen anti-discrimination enforcement authorities in relation to voting practices, the bill would effectively restore preclearance requirements under the Voting Rights Act for any changes to voting practices in states and localities with a history of voting rights violations in the previous 25 years. It would establish formulas to identify such jurisdictions, which would be required to submit proposed changes to the Justice Department for preclearance before implementation. It would require states and localities to review election practices to identify any practices that could impact the ability to vote based on race, color or language minority group and subject any such practices to federal preclearance. It would expand Justice Department authority to assign federal election observers to ensure compliance with federal voting rights protections. It would require states and localities to provide public notice regarding any changes to voting procedures made within 180 days of a federal election, and regarding updated demographic data following any electoral district boundary changes.” The motion was agreed to by a vote of 220-203. [HR 5746, Vote 9, 1/13/22; CQ, 1/13/22]

### 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against The For The People Act

**March 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against The For The People Act, Expanding Access To Voting And Overhauling Campaign Finance And Ethics Laws.** In March 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against The For The People Act. NPR described the bill: “The [For The People Act] seeks 'to expand Americans' access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and implement other
anti-corruption measures for the purpose of fortifying our democracy, and for other purposes.’ The bill's language calls for a complete overhaul of the current system, which varies widely by state and which critics say promotes unfair barriers to voting. Included in the act is mandatory automatic voter registration, restoring voting rights to people with completed felony sentences and a reversal of state voter ID laws that would allow citizens to make a sworn statement affirming their identity if they were unable to produce an ID. […] in politics by requiring organizations to disclose large donors, and it creates a matching system for small donations.” The motion was agreed to 220 - 210. [HR 1, Vote #62, 3/3/21; CQ, 3/3/21; NPR, 3/3/21]

Miller-Meeks Called The For The People Act “Election Non-Integrity” Legislation. “Miller-Meeks as well decried congressional Democrats’ election reform bills, H.R. 1 and S.R. 1, saying the ‘election non-integrity’ legislation will eliminate states’ voter ID requirements at the polls, and put federal bureaucrats in charge of local and state-run elections systems.” [Quad-City Times, 6/26/21]

Miller-Meeks Op-Ed: The For The People Act Was “A Democratic Party Power Grab To Rig The Electoral System In Their Own Favor For Decades To Come.” “And the Democrats have a willing partner in the mainstream media to push their false narrative. The media breathlessly reports on the Democrat bill as ‘landmark voting rights legislation,’ but fails to report the massively unpopular provisions of the corrupt legislation. So, what exactly is S. 1? And what are Democratic senators voting for this week? It’s really just a Democratic Party power grab to rig the electoral system in their own favor for decades to come.” [Fox News, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks Op-Ed, 6/22/21]


August 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against The John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act. In August 2021 Miller-Meeks voted against: “Passage of the bill that would include a number of provisions to strengthen anti-discrimination enforcement authorities in relation to voting practices. The bill would effectively restore preclearance requirements under the Voting Rights Act for any changes to voting practices in states and localities with a history of voting rights violations within the previous 25 years. It would establish formulas to identify such jurisdictions, which would be required to submit proposed changes to the Justice Department for review and approval before they may be implemented. It would establish an "administrative bailout" provision allowing jurisdictions to apply for exemptions to preclearance requirements if they meet eligibility standards related to not implementing discriminatory practices in the previous 10 years. It would also require states and localities to review any newly enacted or adopted election practices to identify whether they include certain practices that could impact the ability to vote based on race, color or language minority group, such as changes to impose stricter voter identification requirements; changes to jurisdictional boundaries or voting locations in jurisdictions with large minority populations; and changes that prohibit the provision of food or drinks to individuals waiting to vote. It would require jurisdictions that adopt such practices to submit them for federal preclearance. It would codify or expand various requirements for court evaluation of "vote denial" and "vote dilution" discrimination claims and other voting rights violations, including to provide for violations in the case of voting practices that have the purpose or will have the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color, including rules that have not yet been implemented. It would expand certain voting rights enforcement authorities, including to allow courts to grant injunctions or require judicial preclearance for changes to voting practices in response to any federal voting rights law prohibiting racial or language discrimination. Among other provisions, it would expand Justice Department authority to assign federal election observers to ensure compliance with federal voting rights protections, including bilingual election requirements. It would require states and localities to provide public notice of any changes to voting procedures made within 180 days of a federal election and to provide public notice of updated demographic data within ten days of any change to electoral district boundaries. It would require the department to make grants to small jurisdictions with a population of 10,000 or less to help them comply with public notice requirements related to voting practices.” The motion was agreed to 219-212. [H Res 4, Vote #260, 8/24/21, CQ 8/24/21]
The Bill Reversed A 2013 Supreme Court Decision That Tossed Out A “Pre-Clearance” Provision And Subjected Certain New Voter Suppression Measures To Preclearance In A Wider Range Of States

Roll Call: “The Chief Aim” Of The John Lewis VRAA Was To Restore DOJ’s “Ability To Preclear […] Election Law Changes In Jurisdictions That Have A History Of Discriminatory Voting Practices.” “The chief aim of the bill is to bring back and update the Justice Department’s ability to preclear, or give the OK to, election law changes in jurisdictions that have a history of discriminatory voting practices against minority voters. Congress is responding to the Supreme Court’s 2013 Shelby County v. Holder decision, which invalidated the mechanism the Justice Department had previously used, which was a provision of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.” [Roll Call, 8/31/21]

Roll Call: The Bill Would Subject Voter ID And Voter Purge Laws To Preclearance In A Wider Range Of Jurisdictions. “The bill would also subject certain proposed laws to preclearance, even potentially in jurisdictions that would not otherwise fall under the 25-year lookback criteria. The bill’s Section 6 would set out several practices, including changes to voter identification needed to vote and maintenance of voter rolls, that could be subject to preclearance. ‘All those that have been shown to be discriminatory would need to be precleared,’ Spaulding said.” [Roll Call, 8/31/21]

Miller-Meeks Made Contradictory Statements About Federal Control Of Elections

March 2021: Miller-Meeks Said “States Should Have Control Over Their Elections, Not The Federal Government” When It Came Time To Vote On The For The People Act…

March 2021: Miller-Meeks Said “States Should Have Control Over Their Elections, Not The Federal Government” And The For The People Act Benefitted “Politicians, Not People.” “Today, March 3rd, 2021, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02) released the following statement after voting NO on H.R 1: ‘The inaccurately titled ‘For the People Act’ does not benefit or help ‘the people’. This legislation would create a campaign donation matching scheme in which every single dollar of campaign donations would be matched by six dollars from the taxpayer. Using public dollars to fund election campaigns and political ads is unacceptable to most Americans, including myself. H.R. 1 should be named after those it really benefits, politicians, not people. I believe that states should have control over their elections, not the federal government. H.R. 1 would even nullify Iowa’s voter ID laws that were found to be constitutional. As an Iowa State Senator, I voted for and supported legislation to give Iowans faith and confidence in their election system. H.R. 1 would undermine state election laws and voter’s trust in their elections, and I cannot support it.’” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 3/3/21]

…Two Months After She Said She Supported Republican Proposals For A “Federal Baseline” For Vote-By-Mail And The Possibility Of Nationally Adopting Voter ID Laws…

January 2021: Miller-Meeks Said She Supported Republican Measures That Provide A Federal Baseline To Ballots Cast By Mail And Signature Verification, And The Consideration Of National Adoption Of Voter ID Laws Like Iowa’s. “Miller-Meeks in her statement said she respects ‘that my patriotic colleagues’ actions are principled and based on their interpretation of the Constitution, knowing that it would not change the outcome of the presidential election. And it is for that reason that we desperately need intensive oversight into election irregularities.’ Miller-Meeks said she supports Republican measures that provide a federal baseline to ballots cast by mail and signature verification, and that state adoption of voter ID laws like Iowa's ‘merits consideration and debate.’ ‘I understand this decision will disappoint and anger my supporters, but I have sworn an oath to support and defend the Constitution above myself,’ Miller-Meeks said.” [Quad-City Times, 1/5/21]

…Despite Promising State Control Over Elections On The Campaign Trail In 2020
Miller-Meeks Said She Would Combat Voter Fraud With Mail-In Voting By Making Sure States Have Control Over Elections While Speaking At A Republican Candidate Forum. At a Johnson County GOP Candidate Forum Miller-Meeks was asked “How would you combat voter fraud with mail-in voting?” Miller-Meeks said “It’s interesting because in the CARES Act, the Democrats and Nancy Pelosi were trying to put in provisions about voting by mail. And so I think it’s very important that we be mindful. Constitutionally elections are the province of the state. So we need to make sure that states have domain over elections and that they’re state run. We in Iowa are fortunate to have a voter ID law that was stood up by our Supreme Court, so we know that our Voter ID law is constitutional. And over the past two years we have worked very hard in the legislature to try to reduce the early voting time. They did get that reduced.” [Johnson County GOP Candidate Forum, 00:04:23:34, 4/24/20] (VIDEO)

Miller-Meeks Said She Supported Iowa’s Tighter Absentee Ballot Deadlines And Voter ID Laws, The Latter Of Which She Called “Highly Supported By The Public”

Miller-Meeks Said Voter ID Laws Were “Highly Supported By The Public” And That “Iowans Can Have Great Confidence And Trust In Their Election System.” “HOST: A recent Iowa poll showed that 32% of Iowans and almost half of Iowans who voted for Donald Trump say they are not confident that the next election results will be, that they can trust the next election results. So there is obviously an attitude out there about a lack of confidence in our elections that has been building off of this. What will it take to lower those numbers, especially given that every review, legal challenge, etc., non-partisan reviews, has shown that the election was conducted fairly and legally? What will it take to convince those Americans that these elections can be trusted? MILLER-MEEKS: Well I think one thing that’s not helpful is to have a bill going through Congress that is put forward by the majority party to get rid of voter ID. The election bill that now is, they’re looking at perhaps changing that in the Senate, and concentrating on the election bill rather than on Build Back Better because at this point in time they don’t have the votes to pass that through the Senate. That getting rid of voter ID, which is highly supported by the public, so you have over 70% of the public supports voter ID. We have voter ID here within the state of Iowa, and if you look at our elections here within the state of Iowa I think Iowans can have great confidence and trust in their election system. So we have put through election law changes in order to secure elections and precisely for that reason, so that people have the confidence that their vote counts. And if anything could tell you your vote counts, it would be my election. So I am probably the poster child. But I think what we did with election law changes, the fact that our voter ID was upheld by our Supreme Court, and then we were told for absentee ballot requests that we needed to codify those changes, those changes were codified. I think in Iowa people can have trust and faith in their elections.” [YouTube, Iowa Press, 12/17/21] (VIDEO) 00:10:10 - 00:12:23

- **Miller-Meeks Said That While She Did Not Think Mail-In And Absentee Ballots Needed To Be Eliminated, She Did Support Iowa’s Requirement Of Requiring Driver’s License Or Voter Identification Numbers.** “HOST: So much of when those complaints or concerns are raised a lot of it is often around mail-in voting, absentee, early voting. Can we still have that system in place and be able to convince people that that is a safe and fair way to conduct elections? Or do you think mail-in voting needs to be constrained if not eliminated? MILLER-MEEKS: I don’t think it needs to be eliminated, I think the process that we have in Iowa where you request a mail-in ballot or you have an absentee ballot request and you request it and then you have your signature and you have either your driver’s license number or your voter identification number, that process I think works extremely well in Iowa and it’s well accepted by the public. And then being able to mail in the ballots, and because we have codified what’s expected, people know it’s expected in Iowa. So we know that your ballot has to be postmarked or barcoded, and had to adapt to that. We had to adapt to changes in postal service delivery. But it has to be barcoded or it has to be postmarked by the day before the election.” [YouTube, Iowa Press, 12/17/21] (VIDEO) 00:12:23 – 00:13:54

- **Miller-Meeks: Iowans Losing Faith In The Voting System “Can Have Confidence And Trust In The Election System Within Iowa” With The Implementation Of “Safeguards” To Prevent Fraud.** “HOST: So just before we move on, what would be your message to those, that 32% of Iowans, half of the Iowans who voted for Donald Trump, who don’t have faith in the current system, what would your message be to them? MILLER-MEEKS: My message would be that they can have confidence and trust in the election system within
Iowa. We have put safeguards in place to both prevent fraud, even though it’s usually extremely low and is very difficult to prove, and that if they’re concerned about fraud, get more people out to vote.” [YouTube, Iowa Press, 12/17/21] (VIDEO) 00:13:54 - 00:14:20

**Miller-Meeks Said Iowans Could Trust Election Results “Because Of The Election Law Changes We Have Made In Iowa In The Past Three Years”**

Miller-Meeks: “Because Of The Election Law Changes We Have Made In Iowa In The Past Three Years, People In Iowa Can Trust That Our Elections Are Fair.” MILLER-MEEKS: “But one thing I can say is because of the election law changes we have made in Iowa in the past three years, people in Iowa can trust that our elections are fair, they can have confidence and trust in our process, and that both parties when they talk about either on one party talking about voter suppression if you ask for voter ID, the other party saying--and I think over the weekend I heard Stacey Abrams and Terry McAuliffe running for governor of Virginia talk about the election was stolen from Stacey Abrams in Georgia when she ran for governor--that on both sides, that undermines competence in our election system. And we need to have trust in, you know, both our election system and institutions of government that are there to help people. In Iowa, I know that we can have trust and confidence in our election system because of the changes we’ve made over the past three years. Other states are also putting in some election integrity measures and security measures. And those laws have been opposed and denigrated, and I don't think that’s helpful for all of us. You know, to me, how do you answer election fraud? If you think there's fraud, the way to answer it, get out to vote, get out to vote in huge numbers. So, people need to turn out to vote, they need to turn out to vote in overwhelming support for the candidate that they choose to support.” [YouTube, WHO13, 11/7/21] (VIDEO) 00:04:47

**Miller-Meeks: Iowans Could “Have Confidence And Trust In Our System Because Of The Election Law Changes That We Made.”** “The Republican message was the same in Davenport, where Davis joined 2nd District U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks for a discussion with Iowa state Republican Sens. Roby Smith of Davenport and Chris Cournoyer of LeClaire, lawyer Alan Ostergren and University of Iowa law professor Derek Muller. ‘In Iowa, we know the system worked,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘We know that people can have confidence and trust in our system because of the election law changes that we made.’ They include Iowa’s 2017 voter ID law and ‘codifying identification process on the absentee ballot request.’” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 10/4/21]

**Miller-Meeks Pushed Back On Claims That Changes To Iowa’s Election Laws Shortening Early Voting And Closing Polling Places Would Make It Harder To Vote For Some**

Miller-Meeks Pushed Back On Claims That Changes To Iowa’s Election Law Shortening Early Voting, Restricting Early Voting Sites, And Restricting Absentee Ballot Requests Will Make It Harder For Some Voters To Cast A Ballot. “Both he and Miller-Meeks pushed back on claims that changes made to Iowa elections law will make it harder for certain voters to cast a ballot. Smith was a lead author and floor manager for changes to Iowa elections laws enacted earlier this year by the GOP-controlled Legislature. The new law shortens Iowa's early voting period, restricts the ability of county auditors to establish satellite in-person early voting sites and forbids auditors from mailing out absentee ballot request forms, among other provisions. ‘We still have over three weeks of early voting,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘So when you have almost a month of time to vote … it seems like there is adequate time for people to be able to vote, whether you’re able to go to the poll and vote in person on the day of the election, or able to vote by mail,’ Miller-Meeks said.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 10/4/21]

**Miller-Meeks: “When You Look At What Happens Where There Is Voter ID And People Can Trust The System, More People Vote.”** “All of those things have led us to the point where we had the largest turnout in the past election cycle that we’ve had,” Miller-Meeks said. ‘I think when you look at what happens where there is voter ID and people can trust the system, more people vote, and that includes in low-income and minority areas as well.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 10/4/21]
August 2021: Miller-Meeks Signed Onto An Amicus Brief Supporting Georgia’s Voter Suppression Bill Against A Department Of Justice Lawsuit. “Congressman Rick W. Allen (GA-12) led over 50 members of Congress in supporting an amicus brief filed today to the U.S. District Court, Northern District Court of Georgia in the upcoming case United States v. Georgia. The brief urges the court to uphold Georgia’s election integrity bill (SB 202), citing the state’s constitutional authority to enact updates to its election laws regarding the times, places, and manner of conducting elections. […] Mariannette Miller-Meeks, M.D. […] On June 25, 2021, the Biden Administration’s Department of Justice (DOJ) announced they were filing a federal lawsuit against the state of Georgia’s election integrity bill, which was signed into law on March 25, 2021.” [Office Of Rep. Rick Allen, Press Release, 8/2/21]


- Republican Representative Bobby Kaufmann Said HF 2486 Was Intended To Prevent Automatic Distribution Of Absentee Ballot Requests In Future Emergency Elections. “After Gov. Kim Reynolds declared a public emergency because of the coronavirus pandemic, Secretary of State Paul Pate mailed absentee ballot requests to registered voters ahead of the state's June 2 primary election, which broke turnout records. While that was popular with many Iowans, including legislators, House State Government Chairman Bobby Kaufmann, R-Wilton, said the changes approved 95-2 in House File 2486 were necessary to prevent Pate's actions from being the model for all future emergency elections. ‘Common-sense constraints’ on the secretary's emergency authority are ‘sorely needed,’ he said.” [Iowa Gazette, 6/11/20]

- HF 2486 Required Legislative Council Approval For Election Changes Under Secretary Of State Emergency Powers. “The Kaufmann-Hunter amendment was in response to the Senate version of the bill that allowed county election officials, campaigns and political parties to mail absentee ballot requests with the approval of their county supervisors, but prohibited the secretary of state from doing the same. ‘What he did was legal,’ Kaufmann said about Pate's decision to mail the requests and to extend the absentee voting period beyond the 29 days in current law. But it was not responsible because of the precedent it set. ‘It sets a precedent that what you liked this time ... when the absentee ballot deadline was extended from 29 to 40 days,’ Kaufmann said. Left unchecked, the secretary could just as easily reduce absentee voting from 29 to five days. ‘We think that's important no matter who’s secretary of state, that one person shouldn’t have the authority to make such significant elections changes without the Legislature’s involvement,’ Kaufmann said. The amendment would require that secretary of state, when making changes under emergency powers, to go before the Legislative Council. The council could approve or reject the plan or come up with its own plan.” [Iowa Gazette, 6/11/20]

May 2020: Miller-Meeks Noted That Mail-In Voting Can Be Done Securely. At a Muscatine County GOP Forum, Miller-Meeks was asked “Do you support or oppose mail-in voting? Why or why not?” Miller-Meeks responded “I don’t support ballot harvesting. But otherwise, mail-in voting can be done and can be done in a way that secures balance that you can make sure that your balance is in. We have such a system in Iowa, and we have voter ID which has been upheld with our supreme court. So I think our absentee ballot mailing position the way that it’s done and conducted in Iowa is secure and are balanced or secure. But certainly having a secretary of state that’s a republic.” [Muscatine County GOP Forum, 01:49:33, 5/26/20] (VIDEO)
Miller-Meeks Said She Did Not Support Ballot Harvesting

Miller-Meeks Said She Did Not Support Ballot Harvesting. At a Muscatine County GOP Forum, Miller-Meeks was asked “Do you support or oppose mail-in voting? Why or why not?” Miller-Meeks responded “I don’t support ballot harvesting. But otherwise, mail-in voting can be done and can be done in a way that secures balance that you can make sure that your balance is in. We have such a system in Iowa, and we have voter ID which has been upheld with our supreme court. So I think our absentee ballot mailing position the way that it’s done and conducted in Iowa is secure and are balanced or secure. But certainly having a secretary of state that’s a republic.” [Muscatine County GOP Forum, 01:49:33, 5/26/20] (VIDEO)

April 2020: Miller-Meeks Said She Had Called The Secretary of State’s Office To “Let Them Know That We Had Worked Very Hard To Reduce The Amount Of Time For Early Voting Legislatively”

April 2020: Miller-Meeks Said She Had Called The Secretary of State’s Office To “Let Them Know That We Had Worked Very Hard To Reduce The Amount Of Time For Early Voting Legislatively.” At a Johnson County GOP Candidate Forum Miller-Meeks was asked “How would you combat voter fraud with mail-in voting?” Miller-Meeks said “I was on a call with the Secretary of State’s office, not with Paul Pate but with a staff member in the Secretary of State’s office and let them know that we had worked very hard to reduce the amount of time for early voting legislatively. And to open that back up, to extend it to where it was prior to the legislation we passed was not well-regarded by some of us. Our Voter ID laws are very important and they have stood up constitutionally, paper ballots are important, and also continuing to reduce the time not expand the time for early voting I think is a very important measure.” [Johnson County GOP Candidate Forum, 00:07:34, 4/24/20] (VIDEO)

April 2020: Miller-Meeks Said She Supported Iowa Voter ID Laws

April 2020: Miller-Meeks Said She Supported Iowa Voter ID Laws. At a Johnson County GOP Candidate Forum Miller-Meeks was asked “How would you combat voter fraud with mail-in voting?” Miller-Meeks said “I was on a call with the Secretary of State’s office, not with Paul Pate but with a staff member in the Secretary of State’s office and let them know that we had worked very hard to reduce the amount of time for early voting legislatively. And to open that back up, to extend it to where it was prior to the legislation we passed was not well-regarded by some of us. Our Voter ID laws are very important and they have stood up constitutionally, paper ballots are important, and also continuing to reduce the time not expand the time for early voting I think is a very important measure. [Johnson County GOP Candidate Forum, 00:07:34, 4/24/20] (VIDEO)

April 2020: Miller-Meeks Encouraged People To Vote By Mail During The Pandemic

Miller-Meeks Encouraged People To Vote By Mail During The Pandemic. “Primary opponent Miller-Meeks has opted for a less casual but more polished social media voice. Looking into the camera of a video Thursday, she encouraged viewers to vote by mail. ‘When we have a tornado or a flood, we know to go clean up after or to go sandbag before, but it didn’t seem like people knew what to during the pandemic,’ she said.” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 4/25/20]

2019: Miller-Meeks Voted To Make It More Difficult For College Students To Vote And Require Polls To Close Earlier

The First Senate Version Of HF 692 Would Have Required Polls Close Earlier And Make It More Difficult For College Students To Vote. “During the session earlier this year, some lawmakers also wanted to close the polls for statewide elections at 8 p.m. instead of 9 p.m., ban public universities as early voting sites and make graduating college students' registrations inactive if on a survey they said they planned to leave the state. Those provisions were included in a bill that passed the Iowa Senate. But all were eliminated from the final version.” [Iowa Gazette, 5/16/19]

Executive Branch Oversight

2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Protecting Our Democracy Act

December 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Protecting Our Democracy Act, Which Contained Provisions To Strengthen Checks On Presidential Powers And The Executive Branch. On December 9, 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against the “Passage of the bill, as amended, that would include a number of provisions to strengthen checks on presidential powers and the executive branch and prohibit foreign influence. Among provisions related to presidential and executive branch accountability and oversight, the bill would void any pardon the president issues to himself or herself. If the president grants a pardon for offenses arising from investigations involving the president or their family members, administration members or campaign employees, it would require the Justice Department to share all materials related to the investigation with Congress. It would exempt the duration of a president or vice president's tenure from the statute of limitations for any federal offense committed by that person prior to or during their tenure. It would include various provisions to limit national emergency powers, including to automatically terminate emergency declarations after 20 congressional session days unless Congress passes a joint resolution of approval and to specify that the president's national emergency powers may not be used to authorize or fund any activity not authorized or funded by Congress. It would require the Justice Department to maintain a log of communications between DOJ and White House officials relating to civil or criminal investigations and require the department's inspector general to review the log for any improper communications. It would specify a list of causes for which the president or an agency head may remove an inspector general. It would strengthen enforcement and penalties under the Hatch Act, which prohibits federal employees from engaging in partisan political activities, including to authorize the Office of Special Counsel to investigate potential violations without first receiving an allegation and clarify that White House senior officials are subject to the Hatch Act. It would expand federal whistleblower protections, including to prohibit retaliation against federal employees who disclose waste, fraud and abuse. Among provisions relating to spending and other Congressional powers, the bill would require appropriated funding to be made available for obligation no later than 90 days before its availability would expire, and prohibit the rescission or deferral of funds in such 90-day period. It would require executive agencies to make public documents used in apportioning appropriations and add congressional notification and reporting requirements related to spending activity. It would statutorily require witnesses subpoenaed by Congress to testify and provide the requested information unless prohibited by federal law or the Constitution. It would affirm Congress' ability to enforce subpoenas through civil lawsuits and require courts to expedite such lawsuits. Among provisions related to elections and foreign influence, it would require major-party candidates for president and vice president to submit their tax returns from the past 10 years to the Federal Election Commission, require the FEC to make such returns public and require the same disclosures annually for the sitting president and vice president. It would require political committees to notify the FBI within one week of any foreign contact by a candidate, or a candidate’s family members or employees. It would prohibit political campaigns from accepting opposition research, polling or other non-public information relating to a candidate from a foreign entity. It would expressly prohibit federal officers, including the president and vice president, from accepting gifts from foreign entities without Congressional authorization. It establish disclosure requirements for internet and digital political advertising and prohibit the use of deepfakes, or materially deceptive audio or visual media, of a federal election candidate.” Passed by a vote of 220-208. [HR 5314, Vote 440, 12/9/21, CQ, 12/9/21]
**2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Granting Voting Rights To Individuals Serving Felony Sentences**

Miller-Meeks Voted Against Granting Voting Rights To Individuals Serving Felony Sentences. In March 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against: “Bush, D-Mo., amendment no. 14 [that would] strike language that would allow the denial of voting rights to individuals serving felony sentences in correctional institutions at the time of an election.” The motion was rejected by a vote of 97 – 328. [HR 1, Vote #53, 3/2/21; CQ, 3/2/21]

**2020: Miller-Meeks Voted To Require That Felons Pay Restitution And Complete Parole And Probation Before Regaining The Right To Vote**


- SF 2348 Required That Felons Pay Restitution And Complete Parole And Probation Before Regaining The Right To Vote. “On a 14-5 vote, with all Republicans present voting ‘yes’ and five of the committee's nine Democrats voting ‘no,’ Senate File 2348 will move to the House floor. The bill, approved 37-11 by the Senate, would require that felons, before regaining the right to vote, would have to complete their sentence, including probation and parole, and pay restitution owed to a victim or victim's family. They would not be required to pay restitution to a company, corporation or government to regain their voting rights. Felons would not be eligible for restoration of their voting rights if they have been convicted of murder, child endangerment resulting in the death of a minor, serious sex offenses or if they are on the sex offender registry, Rep. Bobby Kaufmann, R-Wilton, said.” [Iowa Gazette, 3/11/20]
Energy & Environment Issues

**Significant Findings**

- **2021:** Miller-Meeks voted against her own $22.5 million earmark request for energy and water development on the upper Mississippi River.

- **2021:** Miller-Meeks voted against a bipartisan bill to combat PFAS water contamination two days after publishing an op-ed calling clean water “an obvious policy area where lawmakers can collaborate.”
  - **2021:** Miller-Meeks voted against an amendment to require the defense department to provide training to medical providers on PFAS.

- **2020:** Miller-Meeks expressed openness to increasing the federal fuel tax to fund a 5-10 year infrastructure bill.

- Miller-Meeks said in 2020 she believed climate change was real, but in 2014 wanted to “see more study on climate change causes.”

- **2021:** Miller-Meeks voted against restoring Obama administration methane emissions standards.

- **2021:** Miller-Meeks criticized the funding for electric vehicle car charging in the bipartisan infrastructure package, calling it “misplaced.”
  - Miller-Meeks suggested hiking hybrid vehicle registration fees to pay for infrastructure, and voted to tax electric vehicles in 2019.

- Miller-Meeks repeatedly expressed support for biofuels.
  - **2021:** Miller-Meeks joined letters to Biden arguing for renewal of the renewable fuel standard and consideration for biofuels as a “permanent clean energy solution.”
  - **2021:** Miller-Meeks claimed “advancements in biofuels can drive biofuels towards being carbon neutral or even carbon negative.”
  - **2019:** Miller-Meeks called for Trump to fire EPA Administrator Andrew Wheeler in order to ensure enforcement of the mandate requiring 15 billion gallons of ethanol be blended annually.

- Miller-Meeks repeatedly supported the Trump administration’s looser Navigable Waters Protection Rule over more stringent Waters of the United States (WOTUS) water regulations.
  - **2021:** Following Biden’s announcement of intent to return to WOTUS, Miller-Meeks said WOTUS was confusing and detrimental to the economy.
  - **2021:** Miller-Meeks introduced multiple pieces of legislation opposing repeal or revision of the Trump administration’s Navigable Waters Protection Rule that replaced WOTUS.
  - Miller-Meeks claimed that under the “overreach” of “burdensome” WOTUS rules, the federal government had power to regulate water on 97% of Iowan land.
Miller-Meeks objected to the WOTUS rule, which the EPA called a needed step in fighting polluted rivers and streams, when it was proposed in 2014.

Biofuels

2021: Miller-Meeks Joined Letters To Biden Arguing For Renewal Of The Renewable Fuel Standard Be Renewed And Consideration For Biofuels As A “Permanent Clean Energy Solution”

September 2021: Miller-Meeks Joined A Letter Urging Biden To Uphold The Renewable Fuel Standard In Order To Maintain Demand For Ethanol. “Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, R-Iowa, issued the following news release on Sept. 22, 2021: Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks joined a letter to President Joe Biden urging him to keep his promises on upholding the Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS) by not decimating the demand for billions of gallons of ethanol. ‘Then-candidate Biden made numerous promises to biofuels producers that he would support their livelihoods and uphold the RFS. I am disappointed to see his Administration has begun to make decisions that would be counter to his previous commitments,’ said Miller-Meeks. ‘Biofuels are incredibly important to Iowa's economy, putting money in the pockets of our producers and creating countless jobs across our state. My colleagues and I in the bipartisan Biofuels Caucus will continue to fight to ensure that our energy sector continues to use biofuels to end our dependence on foreign energy, diversify our energy usage, become more environmentally friendly, and create good-paying jobs.’ In their letter, the members highlighted that while running for President, President Biden stated that President Trump's RFS waivers were ‘harmful’ and called for ‘setting strong (Renewable Volumes Obligation) levels for 2021.’ Now, it is again being reported that President Biden's Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is ‘considering big cuts to biofuel blending mandates for 2020, 2021, and 2022.’ This past June, it was reported the Biden Administration was ‘considering ways to provide relief to U.S. oil refiners from biofuel blending mandates.’” [Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks via Targeted News Service, 9/22/21]

May 2021: Miller-Meeks Joined A Letter To Biden Calling Biofuels “A Low Carbon, Cost-Effective Choice To Consumers” And Suggesting Consideration For Biofuels As A “Permanent Clean Energy Solution.” “Today, May 25th, 2021, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02) joined Sens. Joni Ernst (R-IA) and Chuck Grassley (R-IA), and Reps. Randy Feenstra (IA-04) and Ashley Hinson (IA-01) in sending a letter to President Joe Biden urging him to uphold his promise to support biofuels. As the letter states, Biden previously pledged to ‘promote and advance renewable energy, ethanol, and other biofuels to help rural America.’ However, the Administration’s proposed infrastructure bill would spend $174 billion to subsidize electric vehicles while hardly mentioning the biofuel industry. The members point out that Biden has thus far fallen short on his promise. ‘It is our hope that your Administration will come to the table to support the proven solution that biofuels provide to reduce carbon emissions in the transportation sector as quickly as possible,’ the members wrote. ‘The Administration should support flex-fuel vehicles and cost-effective infrastructure improvements that will pave the way to higher biofuel blends.’ The members also urged Biden to recognize the ability for biofuels to be a permanent clean energy solution as developments in farming practices and in carbon capture technology are moving biofuels closer to becoming net carbon negative. ‘Biofuels provide an immediate solution to help decarbonize our transportation sector while supporting rural America and providing a low carbon, cost-effective choice to consumers,’ the members continued. ‘Biofuels should not be treated as a transition fuel but prioritized as a fuel of the future.’” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 5/25/21]


December 2021: Miller-Meeks Said She Supported Rep. Ashley Hinson’s Defend The Blend Act So That The Biden Administration Would Not Go Back On Its Word To Biofuels Producers. “#Biofuels producers deserve better after waiting for all year for certainty. It is unprecedented for this Admin to retroactively reduce finalized levels. I support @RepAshleyHinson’s Defend the Blend Act so the Admin does not go back on their word again.” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 12/7/21]
2021: Miller-Meeks Expressed Support For Allowing Ethanol Product E15 To Be Sold Year-Round

July 2021: Miller-Meeks Said Allowing E15 To Be Sold Year-Round Would Give Consumers More Options And Help Iowa's Economy. “Allowing #ethanol E15 to be sold year-round gives consumers more options and benefits Iowa's economy.” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 7/19/21]

July 2021: Miller-Meeks Said She Was “Incredibly Disappointed” By A Court Decision Blocking Year-Round Use Of E15. “Incredibly disappointed by the court’s decision. I will continue to work towards and push for low cost and low carbon fuel options, including E15. #biofuels #ia02 QUOTE TWEET: @iowafuel: IRFA Executive Director Monte Shaw expresses disappointment over today's #E15 decision. ‘Every legal, regulatory and legislative option will be pursued to reverse this decision.’ View his full statement here: https://iowarfa.org/2021/07/irfa-disappointed-by-dc-circuit-court-decision-on-year-round-e15/” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 7/2/21]

2021: Miller-Meeks Claimed “Advancements In Biofuels Can Drive Biofuels Towards Being Carbon Neutral Or Even Carbon Negative”

Miller-Meeks: “Advancements In Biofuels Can Drive Biofuels Towards Being Carbon Neutral Or Even Carbon Negative.” “Advancements in #biofuels can drive biofuels towards being carbon neutral or even carbon negative – something electric vehicles cannot achieve. #IA02” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 6/7/21]

2021: Miller-Meeks Said She Disapproved Of The Supreme Court’s Decision In Favor Of Small Oil Refineries In A Biofuel Waiver Dispute

June 2021: Miller-Meeks Said The Supreme Court Decision In Favor Of Small Oil Refineries In A Biofuel Waiver Dispute Would “ Seriously Hurt Our Farmers And Iowa's #Biofuels Industry.” “This #SCOTUS decision will seriously hurt our farmers and Iowa’s #biofuels industry because of poorly crafted legislation. Congress needs to act to support the #RFS. #IowaAg QUOTE TWEET: @StephanieKellyM: BREAKING: Supreme Court rules in favor of small oil refineries in biofuel waiver dispute. Huge blow to the biofuel industry. #OOT” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 6/25/21]

2019: Miller-Meeks Called For Trump To Fire EPA Administrator Wheeler In Order To Ensure Enforcement Of The Mandate Requiring 15 Billion Gallons Of Ethanol Be Blended Annually

November 2019: Miller-Meeks Called For Trump To Fire EPA Administrator Wheeler In Order To Ensure Enforcement Of The Ethanol Mandate. “CLEAN HOUSE: It's time for President Trump to get rid of EPA Administrator Wheeler to ensure the ethanol mandate is met. The EPA is dragging its feet instead of enforcing the mandate, and Iowa farmers need marketplace predictability.” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 11/1/19]

October 2019: Miller-Meeks Said She Welcomed “President Trump’s Announcement That The EPA Is Accountable To Enforce The Federal Law Requirement To Blend 15 Billion Gallons Of Ethanol Annually.” “I welcome President Trump’s announcement that the EPA is accountable to enforce the federal law requirement to blend 15 billion gallons of ethanol annually. Supporting our farmers and ethanol producers creates Iowa jobs and strengthens our economy. #IA02” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 10/4/19]

2019: Miller-Meeks Said She Personally Used Blended Ethanol In All Of Her Own Vehicles, Including A 2003 Manual Transmission Hybrid

2019: Miller-Meeks Said She Personally Used Blended Ethanol In All Of Her Own Vehicles, Including A 2003 Manual Transmission Hybrid. “Wrong! I use blended ethanol in all my vehicles, including my 2003 Honda...”
Civic Hybrid (stick shift) that has 439,xxx miles. Never had a problem! QUOTE TWEET: @Greg0526321: Funny thing is people in IOWA don't use Ethanol Blended gas in there personal cars and equipment, it cost too much to repair the damage the ethanol does to the motors.” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 10/5/19]

**Clean Water**


Miller-Meeks Voted Against A Bipartisan Bill To Combat PFAS Water Contamination Two Days After Publishing An Op-Ed Where She Called Clean Water “An Obvious Policy Area Where Lawmakers Can Collaborate.” “A bill that passed the US House of Representatives on Wednesday aims to track dangerous chemicals impacting water quality. The PFAS Action Act passed 241-183 and US Rep. Cindy Axne was the only Iowan to vote in favor. The Democrat, who represents Iowa’s Third Congressional District, was joined by 23 Republican colleagues who voted with the Democrats on the bill. […] Iowa’s Republican US Reps. Ashley Hinson, Randy Feenstra, and Mariannette Miller-Meeks voted against the bill. However, on Monday, two days before she voted ‘no,’ Miller-Meeks wrote an op-ed for The Oskaloosa Herald about a different, unrelated water bill, where she called clean water a priority. ‘In a time of deep partisanship, clean water should be an obvious policy area where lawmakers can collaborate,’ she wrote. ‘It is crucial to the lifeblood of our country and ensuring its accessibility is critical to protecting American families.’” [Iowa Starting Line, 7/22/21]


| July 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against A Bipartisan Bill To Regulate Toxic PFAS Chemicals In Drinking Water. “The U.S. House passed bipartisan legislation Wednesday that would regulate toxic chemicals found in drinking water, as well as designate two types of those toxic chemicals as hazardous substances that would spark federal cleanup standards. The bill, H.R. 2467, also known as the PFAS Action Act of 2021, passed 241-183, with 23 Republicans joining Democrats in voting for it. Iowa’s delegation divided along party lines, with Democrat Rep. Cindy Axne voting in favor and Republican Reps. Randy Feenstra, Ashley Hinson and Mariannette Miller-Meeks voting against.”” [Iowa Capital Dispatch, 7/21/21]

| July 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Revising Environmental Laws And Requiring The EPA To Regulate PFAS, Which Scientists Have Linked To Numerous Serious Health Conditions |

| July 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against The PFAS Action Act, Authorizing The EPA To Address The Impacts Of Per-And Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS) On Drinking Water. In February 2015, Miller-Meeks voted against: “Passage of the bill that would require the Environmental Protection Agency to take a number of regulatory actions and establish grant programs to address the impacts of per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances, or PFAS. Specifically, it would require the EPA to designate certain PFAS -- perfluorooctanoic acid and its salts, as well as perfluorooctane sulfonic acid and its salts -- as hazardous chemicals under the Comprehensive Environmental Protection Act,” [Iowa Capital Dispatch, 7/21/21]
Response, Compensation and Liability Act and determine whether all PFAS should be designated as such within five years of enactment. It would require the EPA to issue a national primary drinking water regulation for maximum contaminant levels of certain PFAS, within two years of enactment, and issue health advisories for PFAS not subject to the regulation. It would authorize $500 million annually through fiscal 2026 for an EPA infrastructure assistance grant program for community water systems affected by PFAS to implement water treatment technologies that can remove all detectable amounts of PFAS from drinking water. It would require the EPA to establish effluent limits and pretreatment standards for PFAS in wastewater and authorize $200 million annually through fiscal 2026 for an EPA grant program to help publicly owned treatment works implement such standards. It would authorize $100 million annually through 2026 for an EPA grant program to test for and install and maintain water filtration systems to address PFAS in school drinking water. Among other provisions, it would require the EPA to add certain PFAS to lists of hazardous air pollutants under the Clean Air Act; issue rules to require toxicity testing on all PFAS by manufacturers; create a public risk-communication strategy regarding PFAS hazards; update voluntary labeling requirements for certain consumer products, including cooking implements, carpets and clothing, to certify that they do not contain any PFAS; and issue guidance on reducing the use of firefighting foam and related products that contain PFAS by first responders.” The bill passed 241 to 183. [HR 2467, Vote #217, 7/21/21; CQ, 7/21/21]

- **Scientists Found Links Between PFASs And Kidney And Testicular Cancer, Thyroid Disease, Liver Damage, High Cholesterol, And Other Diseases.** “Because of their widespread use, release and disposal over the decades, PFASs show up virtually everywhere: in soil, surface water, the atmosphere, the deep ocean—and even the human body. The U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention’s Web site says that the agency has found PFASs in the blood of nearly everyone it has tested for them, ‘indicating widespread exposure to these PFAS in the U.S. population.’ Scientists have found links between a number of the chemicals and many health concerns—including kidney and testicular cancer, thyroid disease, liver damage, developmental toxicity, ulcerative colitis, high cholesterol, pregnancy-induced preeclampsia and hypertension, and immune dysfunction.” [Scientific American, 1/22/21]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against An Amendment To Require The Defense Department To Provide Training To Medical Providers On PFAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

September 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against An Amendment To Require The Defense Department To Provide Training To Medical Providers On PFAS. On September 22, 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against the “Slotkin, D-Mich., amendment no. 15 that would require the Defense Department to provide department medical providers with mandatory training with respect to the potential health effects of per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances.” The amendment was adopted 236 to 186. [CQ, 9/22/21; H.R. 4350, Vote 272, 9/22/21]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Her Own $22.5 Million Earmark Request For Energy And Water Development On The Upper Mississippi River</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

July 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against HR 4502, An Appropriations Bill Including Funds For Environment, Energy, And Water Development


Miller-Meeks Voted Against H.R. 4502. [H.R. 4502, Vote 247, 7/29/21]
Miller-Meeks Requested $22.5 Million For The Upper Mississippi River –Navigation And Ecosystem Sustainability Program. ‘Proposed recipient: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Rock Island District Recipient address: 1500 Rock Island Dr, Rock Island, IL 61201 Requested amount: $22,500,000 Explanation of request: NESP has widespread bipartisan support from the five states on the UMRS and the support of industry, America’s building trades, and environmental groups. Therefore, we are requesting full funding of NESP’s construction for FY 22. NESP has a total FY 22 construction-ready capability of $22.5 million.’ [Office Of Rep. Miller-Meeks, Accessed 7/30/21]

The Upper Mississippi River NESP Funding Was Included In The Energy And Water Development Subcommittee Appropriations Bill. ‘It is those last two connections the pair celebrated last week with news that their bipartisan request for $22.5 million for lock and dam — as well as environmental — renovations on the Mississippi River had passed the Appropriations Committee as part of the 2021 funding bill for Energy and Water Development. The project would breathe life into the Upper Mississippi River Navigation and Ecosystem Sustainability Program, which had sat stagnant for years. […] ‘This is absolutely a crucial issue for our river economies,’ said Hinson during her weekly call with Iowa press on Friday. ‘This is about safety, expediency, efficiency and making sure we have viable ways to get our products to market. The entire country is dependent upon the river economy of the Mississippi River. It’s a huge win for the Midwest, specifically Iowa’s farmers and ag producers.’’ [Telegraph Herald, 7/18/21]

2021: Following Biden’s Announcement Of Intent To Return To WOTUS, Miller-Meeks Said WOTUS Was Confusing And Detrimental To The Economy

Miller-Meeks Praised The “Succinct, Concrete Metrics” Of The Navigable Waters Protection Rule In Contrast To WOTUS, Which She Said “Leaves Too Much Interpretation Up To Whoever Is In Authority.” ‘I’m just grateful to my colleagues for being here. It elevates this issue and it’s something that affects every American. It doesn’t matter if you’re a road builder, if you’re a sand and gravel quarry, if you’re a home builder, it affects all of this in all aspects of our life. Whether you’re in a rental or you’re wanting to buy a home, the largest or the smallest, multi-family housing, the Navigable Waters Protection Rule put in succinct, concrete metrics for what was considered a navigable waterway and going back to WOTUS really hampers us because it leaves too much interpretation up to whoever is in authority to implement those rules and regulations. And that regulation, back to the WOTUS regulation, is vague to begin with. That leaves a lot of uncertainty. So will someone take the risk to try to build housing that the average person can afford and move into? And how does that impact our rural communities?’ [KNIA-KRLS Radio, 8/19/21] (AUDIO) 00:07:10-00:08:07

Miller-Meeks Said She Went On Tour To ‘Speak Out Against The Biden Administration’s Recent Decision To Rescind The 2020 Navigable Waters Protection Rule.’ ‘On a sunny Wednesday morning, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (R-IA) made a visit to Pella for a National Home Builders Association Field Tour. She traveled with Congressman Dan Newhouse (R-WA) and Congressman Bill Johnson (R-Ohio), as well as American Farm Bureau President Zippy Duvall. The visit was a part of a tour where the Representatives speak out against the Biden Administration’s recent decision to rescind the 2020 Navigable Waters Protection Rule. All three are members of the Congressional Western Caucus, and they’ve been publicly vocal about keeping the Navigable Waters Protection Rule. The elected officials had the opportunity to take a tour around a home under construction while speaking with stakeholders on issues related to housing. For Miller-Meeks, she said one of the most notable outcomes of the pandemic is it reinforced how communities can work together while living in small, rural areas. According to the Des Moines Register, the population of Pella has increased by 1 percent. While more people live in the area, Miller-Meeks said it’s important for workers to have access towards more affordable homes. ‘We continually hear that housing is an issue to bring in new workers,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘You can’t expand your business if you don't have a workforce of people to fill those jobs.’’ [Oskaloosa Herald, 8/18/21]
June 2021: Following Biden’s Announcement Of Intent To Return To WOTUS, Miller-Meeks Said WOTUS Hurt And Confused American Farmers And Producers And Hindered Economic Development. ‘Today, June 9th, 2021, Reps. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02) and Dan Newhouse (WA-04), the Chairman of the Congressional Western Caucus, released the following statements after the Biden Administration announced its intent to revise the definition of ‘waters of the United States’ and rescind the Navigable Waters Protection Rule (NWPR): ‘I am incredibly disappointed with the EPA’s plans to roll back the Navigable Waters Protection Rule. I have spoken with Iowans dozens of times about the issues created by the 2015 Waters of the United States Rule,’ said Miller-Meeks. ‘WOTUS hurt American farmers, ranchers, landowners, and businesses, caused confusion, and hindered economic development. I proudly introduced a resolution to uphold the NWPR with Chairman Newhouse because this Rule is much more supportive of rural America and our economy.’’ [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 6/9/21]

June 2021: Miller-Meeks Joined A Letter Urging Biden Uphold The 2020 Navigable Waters Protection Rule And Support Biofuels. ‘Today, June 15th, 2021, Reps. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02), Ashley Hinson (IA-01), and Randy Feenstra (IA-04) sent a letter to both U.S. Secretary of Agriculture Tom Vilsack and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Administrator Michael S. Regan urging the EPA not to repeal the 2020 Navigable Waters Protection Rule (NWPR) and expressing concern over reports that the Administration is considering ethanol blend mandate reprieves to oil refiners, which would devastate Iowa's biofuel industry. The lawmakers wrote: ‘The link between energy policy and agricultural policy is not only strong, but it is co-dependent. We ask that you please make a commitment to ensure these conversations about clean water and biofuels are not one-sided. Conversations and decisions need not only to come from both USDA and EPA together, but also from real farmers in rural America who understand the art and science of farming deeper than any of us are able to from behind our desks. To empower our farmers, the Administration needs to listen to their concerns, suggestions, and expertise to make an informed decision.’’ [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 6/15/21]

2021: Miller-Meeks Introduced An Amendment Blocking Repeal Or Revision Of The Trump Administration’s Navigable Waters Protection Rule

Miller-Meeks Introduced An Amendment Blocking Repeal Or Revision Of The Trump Administration’s Navigable Waters Protection Rule. ‘Today, House Democrats blocked two amendments to the Minibus Appropriations package offered by Representatives Jim Hagedorn (MN-01) and Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02) that would have prevented funds from being used to repeal, revise, or replace the Trump Administration’s Navigable Waters Protection Rule, known as WOTUS. The amendments were cosponsored by 94 House Republicans and was supported by the National Association of Home Builders. […] ‘I am disappointed to see that our commonsense amendment to protect the rights of farmers, homeowners, ranchers, and builders was blocked. Under the 2015 WOTUS Rule, the federal government would have authority to regulate water on 97 percent of the land in Iowa,’ said Miller-Meeks. ‘The 2020 NWPR is much more workable and keeps our water and land clean without destroying businesses in the process. I will continue to fight against government overreach to support Americans’ rights to use their land how they see fit.’’ [Office Of Rep. Jim Hagedorn, Press Release, 7/27/21]

2021: Miller-Meeks Sponsored A Resolution Expressing That The 2020 Navigable Waters Protection Rule Should Not Be Withdrawn Or Vacated

April 2021: Miller-Meeks Sponsored A Resolution Expressing That The 2020 Navigable Waters Protection Rule Should Not Be Withdrawn Or Vacated. On April 14, 2021, Miller-Meeks sponsored H Res. 318, which “expresses the sense of the House of Representatives that (1) clean water is a national priority, and (2) the 2020 final rule titled The Navigable Waters Protection Rule: Definition of ‘Waters of the United States’ should not be withdrawn or vacated.” The bill was read twice and referred to House Transportation and Infrastructure. [H Res. 318, Sponsored, 4/14/21; CQ, 4/14/21]

introduced a resolution to uphold the Navigable Waters Protection Rule (NWPR) into law. This resolution would express the sense of the House that clean water is a national priority and that the April 21st, 2020, NWPR should not be withdrawn or vacated. A Senate companion to this resolution was introduced by Sen. Joni Ernst (R-IA) in January and currently has 27 cosponsors.” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 4/14/21]

### Miller-Meeks Claimed That Under The “Overreach” Of “Burdensome” WOTUS Rules, The Federal Government Had Power To Regulate Water On 97% Of Iowan Land

April 2021: Miller-Meeks Said NWPR Reversed The “Overreach” Of WOTUS, Under Which She Claimed “The Federal Government Would Have Authority To Regulate Water On 97 Percent Of The Land In Iowa.” “The 2015 Waters of the United States (WOTUS) Rule significantly expanded the definition of WOTUS and gave the federal government authority to regulate almost any waters; including streams, ditches, ponds, and creeks. The NWPR revised the definition of WOTUS and reversed this overreach, bringing back a balance between federal and state jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act. ‘Under the WOTUS Rule, the federal government would have authority to regulate water on 97 percent of the land in Iowa.’” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 4/14/21]

Miller-Meeks: WOTUS “Left Farmers, Ranchers, Landowners, And Businesses To Face Confusion And Burdensome Restrictions On How To Use Their Property.” “Under the WOTUS Rule, the federal government would have authority to regulate water on 97 percent of the land in Iowa This left farmers, ranchers, landowners, and businesses to face confusion and burdensome restrictions on how to use their property,’ said Miller-Meeks. ‘The NWPR is much more workable and keeps our water and land clean without destroying businesses in the process. I look forward to working with my colleagues to protect our environment while also supporting our farmers and ranchers.’” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 4/14/21]


Miller-Meeks Op-Ed: NWPR Redirected The Federal Government’s Clean Water Efforts Towards ‘Clearly Defined Bodies Of Water’ And Away From The ‘Streams And Ponds’ WOTUS Included. ‘The Clean Water Act gives the Environmental Protection Agency and the Army Corps of Engineers jurisdiction over ‘navigable waters’ in the United States, but it leaves this definition up to the federal agencies to define. WOTUS drastically expanded this jurisdiction over bodies of water like streams and ponds — including those on private land — that the Clean Water Act never intended to regulate. Instead of burdening private citizens with confusing and ambiguous standards that could end up costing them thousands of dollars, the NWPR ensures that the federal government’s clean water efforts are focused on clearly defined bodies of water.’ [Des Moines Register, Mariannette Miller-Meeks and Dan Newhouse Op-Ed, 4/14/21]

Miller-Meeks Op-Ed: NWPR Encouraged “Empowering Our State And Local Governments, Communities, Tribes, And Businesses” To Collaborate With Federal Agencies And Led To Job Creation. ‘Empowering our state and local governments, communities, tribes, and businesses to work collaboratively with the federal government results in stronger environmental protections. These are the kind of partnerships we should be encouraging, and that is exactly what the NWPR does. Not only will this rule result in stronger protections for clean water, but when business owners have clarity, it leads to job creation. We have seen this firsthand in Iowa. Sen. Joni Ernst has been a strong leader in preserving the protections for Iowa industries under the NWPR, and we are proud to join her in these efforts as members of the Congressional Western Caucus.’ [Des Moines Register, Mariannette Miller-Meeks and Dan Newhouse Op-Ed, 4/14/21]

### 2019: Miller-Meeks Voted For Prohibiting Private Entities From Acquiring Land For A Source Water Pollution Project And Then Selling Or Donating That Land To The Government

2019: Miller-Meeks Voted For Prohibiting Private Entities From Acquiring Land For A Source Water Pollution Project And Then Selling Or Donating That Land To The Government
2019: Miller-Meeks Voted For Prohibiting Certain Land Sales And Acquisitions. Miller-Meeks voted for SF 548, “a bill for an act relating to the acquisition, donation, or sale of real property for specified purposes. The bill passed by vote 32-17. [Iowa State Legislature, SF 548, 3/20/19]

- **SF 548 Prohibited Private Entities From Acquiring Land For A Source Water Pollution Project And Then Selling Or Donating That Land To The Government.** “SF 548 prohibits a private entity from acquiring land for a nonpoint source water pollution control project and then selling or donating the land to a political subdivision, the Department of Natural Resources (DNR), or the federal government.” [Iowa State Legislature, SF 548 Fiscal Note, 3/20/19]

- **SF 548 Prohibited Private Entities Including Conservation Projects From Borrowing From The State Revolving Fund For Land Acquisitions.** “Beginning July 1, 2019, the Bill also prohibits a private entity from borrowing moneys from the State Revolving Fund (SRF) to acquire land. The Bill does allow a private entity to keep any land that was purchased prior to July 1, 2019. […] The Iowa Natural Heritage Foundation (INHF) is a private nonprofit organization with the goal to protect and restore Iowa’s land, water, and wildlife. The organization is supported by member donations, and the moneys are used to implement conservation projects, which can include the purchase of land. Since 2006, the INHF has borrowed $48.0 million from the SRF to acquire land, and as of March 5, 2019, the INHF owes the SRF $9.0 million. The purchase of land using funding from the SRF was prohibited for FY 2019 with the passage of HF 2502 (FY 2019 Standings Appropriations Act), which specified that the Environmental Protection Commission could not approve water pollution control works projects that included the purchase of land using the SRF for financing during FY 2019.” [Iowa State Legislature, SF 548 Fiscal Note, 3/20/19]

- **SF 548 Targeted Loans Taken Out By The Natural Heritage Foundation To Purchase Lands To Donate To Conservation Work.** “The Iowa Natural Heritage Foundation bought 172 acres of land along and near the West Fork of the Cedar River in Butler County. It’s one of the many patchwork puzzle pieces stitched together to form the 6,100-acre Big Marsh Wildlife Management Area wetland complex. The Natural Heritage Foundation used a low-interest loan from the State Revolving Fund to buy the land, which eventually was turned over to the Department of Natural Resources. The loan, plus costs and interests, was repaid. The foundation has tapped the fund, created by the Clean Water Act, on 54 water quality projects over the past 12 years. That includes four projects along the Wapsipinicon River in Buchanan County. But if Senate File 548 becomes law, the loan fund will be off limits to the foundation or any private entity that hopes to use its loans to buy land for conservation work before handing it over to government. The bill has cleared the Senate and may or may not pass the House sometime between my typing and your reading. Here’s to hoping it gets snagged and scuttled…But it is yet another sign the Republican-controlled Legislature doesn’t really care about clean water. If the GOP did care, it wouldn’t be removing a tool from a water cleanup toolbox that’s already woefully inadequate to fix the problems we face. It would be adding tools and resources and helping organizations on the front lines, not throwing up barriers.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, Todd Dorman Opinion, 4/14/19; S.F. 548, Journal of the Senate, 3/20/19]

- **Todd Dorman Op-Ed: The Bill Showed That The GOP Did Not “Care About Clean Water,” Because The Bill Would Remove “A Tool From A Water Cleanup Toolbox.”** “But if Senate File 548 becomes law, the loan fund will be off limits to the foundation or any private entity that hopes to use its loans to buy land for conservation work before handing it over to government. The bill has cleared the Senate and may or may not pass the House sometime between my typing and your reading. Here’s to hoping it gets snagged and scuttled…But it is yet another sign the Republican-controlled Legislature doesn’t really care about clean water. If the GOP did care, it wouldn’t be removing a tool from a water cleanup toolbox that’s already woefully inadequate to fix the problems we face. It would be adding tools and resources and helping organizations on the front lines, not throwing up barriers.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, Todd Dorman Op-Ed, 4/14/19; S.F. 548, Journal of the Senate, 3/20/19]

Note: Signed into law by Governor Kim Reynolds May 9, 2019
**2014: Miller-Meeks Objected To The Obama Administration’s WOTUS Proposal To Regulate Waterways, Which The EPA Called A Needed Step In Fighting Polluted Rivers And Streams**

Miller-Meeks says that regulation is crushing business, and she objects to the Obama administration’s proposal to regulate waterways - a needed step in fighting polluted rivers and streams, the federal EPA says - as well as a proposal to lower carbon dioxide emissions from coal-fired power plants.” [The Quad-City Times, 10/13/14]

**Fossil Fuels**

**2021: Miller-Meeks Called On The Biden Administration To Rescind “The Executive Order That Paused American Energy Exploration”**

December 2021: Miller-Meeks Called On The Biden Administration To Rescind “The Executive Order That Paused American Energy Exploration.” “If the Administration is serious about solving the current energy crisis, we must start by rescinding the Executive Order that paused American energy exploration. @KYOUTV” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 12/1/21]

**2021: Miller-Meeks Said She Opposed Biden’s Keystone Pipeline Shutdown, Claiming Natural Gas Was “Clean And Carbon-Friendly” And That The Project Created Thousands Of Jobs**

Miller-Meeks: Natural Gas Was “Clean And Carbon-Friendly” But Biden “Shut Down The Keystone Pipeline Immediately.” NIEDLEMAN: “And when the statistic I gave you just a moment ago was the United States ranks 10th in the industrial countries essentially. You mentioned Iowa’s leading the way, but shouldn't the United States be a world leader in this area?” MILLER-MEEKS: “Well, I think the United States was a world leader. We were also a world leader in energy production. Think how clean and carbon-friendly natural gas is, but yet. President Biden shut down the Keystone Pipeline immediately, and lifted sanctions from Russia for the Nord Stream 2 Pipeline to go forward.” [YouTube, Local 4 News WHBF, 6/20/21] (VIDEO)

**Miller-Meeks Said Stopping The Keystone Pipeline Eliminated Thousands Of Jobs, But The 1,950 Potential Jobs From The Project Would Have Been Temporary And Fluctuated Throughout Construction**

Miller-Meeks Criticized Biden’s Decision To Stop The Keystone Pipeline And Said The Results Were “Eliminating Thousands Of Jobs, And Giving More Power To Foreign Energy Producers.” “I appreciated President Biden’s rhetoric on bringing jobs back to America and I look forward to working with the Administration to do so. But, in the first 100 days, the Biden Administration killed the Keystone XL Pipeline, eliminating thousands of jobs, and giving more power to foreign energy producers.” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 4/29/21]

- The Keystone Pipeline Project Would Have Created 1,950 Jobs, But Those Jobs Were Temporary And Would Have Fluctuated Throughout Construction. “The Biden administration has announced plans to raise the tax rate on households making more than $400,000. Michels Corp. and Precision Pipeline, two Wisconsin companies contracted for the Keystone project, were to create 1,950 jobs; however, those jobs were temporary and would have fluctuated throughout construction, according to a Politifact factcheck.” [Ames Tribune, 4/29/21]

**Miller-Meeks: “If This Administration Really Cared About Workers’ Rights, It Would Not Have Canceled The Keystone XL Pipeline On Day One.”** “Today, March 9th, 2021, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02), a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, released the following statement after voting NO on H.R. 842, the Protecting the Right to Organize Act. ‘Supporting workers and businesses are not mutually exclusive; we
can do both at the same time. The PRO Act is an unnecessary challenge to the rights of business owners and workers alike. The bill would abolish right-to-work laws across the country, including the laws we have in Iowa, and is yet another attack on states’ rights. If this Administration really cared about workers’ rights, it would not have canceled the Keystone XL Pipeline on day one, a move that was opposed by several major unions, including the Teamsters and AFL-CIO. Even though I have family members who were members of unions, I could not support this gift to union bosses.”” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 3/9/21]

2021: Miller-Meeks Said Tapping The Strategic Petroleum Reserve Was “The Wrong Approach” To Addressing High Gas Prices, Which She Called An “Energy Crisis”

Miller-Meeks: Tapping The Strategic Petroleum Reserve Was “The Wrong Approach” And “Will Not Fix The Current Energy Crisis.” “Tapping the emergency Strategic Petroleum Reserve will not fix the current energy crisis and is the wrong approach. We need to be actively supporting an all-of-the-above energy agenda that maximizes American resources, not one that suppresses them.” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 11/23/21]

- November 2021: President Biden Announced Release Of Strategic Petroleum Reserve To Lower Oil And Gas Prices And Address Post-Pandemic Supply Issues. “Today, the President is announcing that the Department of Energy will make available releases of 50 million barrels of oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to lower prices for Americans and address the mismatch between demand exiting the pandemic and supply.” [White House, Press Release, 11/23/21]

November 2021: Miller-Meeks Joined A Letter Warning That Tapping The Strategic Petroleum Reserve Would Increase Reliance On Foreign Energy Sources In The Long Run. “Today, November 19th, 2021, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02) joined over 30 of her colleagues, led by Rep. Stephanie Bice (OK-05), in a letter to President Joe Biden and Energy Secretary Jennifer Granholm opposing their plan to tap into the Strategic Petroleum Reserve (SPR) to slow rising fuel costs and address the current energy crisis. ‘For months, Americans have been paying higher prices at the gas pump and the Biden Administration has done little to help them. Instead of supporting an all-around energy plan, the Administration has increased our dependence on foreign energy. Tapping into the emergency reserves like the SPR is not going to help in the long run,’ said Miller-Meeks. ‘We should not be increasing our reliance on foreign energy sources such as Russia, Iran, and Venezuela. These policies have hurt American jobs, workers, and our economy when we should be working around the clock to support them.” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 11/19/21]

2020: Miller-Meeks Said An Increase In The Federal Fuel Tax Was An Option For Funding Infrastructure Projects

September 2020: Miller-Meeks Said An Increase In The Federal Fuel Tax Was An Option For Funding Infrastructure Projects. “Miller-Meeks said the infrastructure needs are clear, but the source of cash to pay for the work is less so. ‘The question is, how do we pay for that? We know that with electric vehicles and hybrid vehicles, our road-use tax revenues have decreased,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘Our state in fact increased its fuel tax several years ago to try to adjust and adapt for that. I would be glad to pay a higher registration fee for my hybrid vehicle to help pay’ for infrastructure projects, she added. Governments have struggled as Americans drive less, or drive more-efficient vehicles. That means they buy less fuel, and pay less taxes that traditionally have paid for road work. ‘I think we all know that our bridges, our locks on the Mississippi River, our dams, our highways’ need work, Miller-Meeks said. ‘Some of our roads in Ottumwa are terrible.’ Congress needs to pass an infrastructure bill covering five to 10 years of projects, possibly paid for by an increase in the federal fuel tax, Miller-Meeks said. At the same time, the federal government should back research into how to make roads last longer, she added.” [Iowa Capital Dispatch, 9/10/20]

Miller-Meeks: “I Support Continued Investments In Making Coal Burn Cleaner, Developing Liquefied Coal, Increasing Domestic Oil Production.”
Miller-Meeks: “I Support Continued Investments In Making Coal Burn Cleaner, Developing Liquefied Coal, Increasing Domestic Oil Production.” According to Miller-Meeks for Congress 2010 website under “Energy Security for America, Jobs for Iowa”, Miller-Meeks said “I support continued investments in making coal burn cleaner, developing liquefied coal, increasing domestic oil production, making it easier to bring new refineries online to help with demand, and investing in alternative fuels like hydrogen, wind, and solars. We have one of the finest nuclear facilities with the Duane Arnold plant in Palo, Iowa, and it should be permitted to bring another plant online.” [Miller-Meeks for Congress 2010, accessed 6/15/20]

Miller-Meeks Claimed The Environmental Protection Agency Was Waging A War On Coal

Miller-Meeks Criticized EPA For “War on Coal”. “Miller-Meeks criticized government overreach […] she faulted Congress for not addressing the patient-care scandals at the Veterans Administration, and the Environmental Protection Agency for what she called a ‘war on coal.’” [The Gazette, 1/12/14]

Miller-Meeks Believed Coal Was The Most Abundant, Cheapest And Efficient Energy Resource And Ignoring Coal Would Be A Grave Mistake To Ignore It Simply Because It Is A Fossil Fuel

Miller-Meeks Believed Coal Was The Most Abundant, Cheapest And Efficient Energy Resource And Ignoring Coal Would Be A Grave Mistake To Ignore It Simply Because It Is A Fossil Fuel. According to Miller-Meeks for Congress 2010 website under “Energy Security for America, Jobs for Iowa”, Miller-Meeks said “And with coal as our nation’s most abundant, cheapest and efficient energy resource, already providing half of America’s power needs, it would be a grave mistake to ignore it simply because it is a fossil fuel. There are more than 200 years of available coal reserves within our borders, the equivalent of 3 times Saudi Arabia’s proven oil reserves.” [Miller-Meeks for Congress 2010, accessed 6/15/20]

Ottumwa Courier: Miller-Meeks Favored Expanding Drilling For Oil On U.S. Territory, “But Said That Expansion Must Be Balanced Against Environmental Concerns”

Ottumwa Courier: Miller-Meeks Favored Expanding Drilling For Oil On U.S. Territory, “But Said That Expansion Must Be Balanced Against Environmental Concerns.” “This district is primely suited for making an industry in energy, she said, pointing to biomass, solar and nuclear energy as options. ‘We have a tremendous opportunity.’ Miller-Meeks favors expansion of drilling for oil on U.S. territory, but said that expansion must be balanced against environmental concerns.” [The Ottumwa Courier, 5/21/08]

Climate Change & Clean Air Measures

2014: Miller-Meeks Said She Wanted To “See More Study On Climate Change Causes And Solutions”

2014: Miller-Meeks Said She Wanted To “See More Study On Climate Change Causes And Solutions.” “Miller-Meeks, however, has not made a persuasive case for why voters should remove the incumbent. Her policy positions are vague, and she hedges on a number of key issues, including offering no specifics on how to assure both Social Security and Medicare will be solvent for future retirees. She supports more spending for roads and bridges, but she says she needs more information on options for how to pay for such improvements. She also wants to see more study on climate change causes and solutions. She is not shy about expressing contempt for the Affordable Care Act, though she acknowledges it is law. And she is unflinching in criticizing President Obama for pulling U.S. troops from Iraq too soon and for a lack of clarity in dealing with terrorist threats.” [Des Moines Register, Editorial Board, 10/22/14]

2020: Miller-Meeks Said She Believed Climate Change Was Real
December 2020: Miller-Meeks Said She Believed Climate Change Was Real And Suggested Potential Actions To Address Its Effects. “During the campaign, Miller-Meeks was asked at one of the debates with Hart about climate change. She said she believed it was real, which many in her party do not agree with that. She said there is a variety of things that can be done and some things that need to be worked out as we move into the future. She spoke about the Million Trees Project, which has a goal of getting that many trees planted. Renewable energy like solar and wind power will likely continue to get tax credits, but there are some issues with solar panels getting rare earth elements from China and that country not having the labor practices or conservation practices this country has. Turbine blades also need a way to be recycled after they have gone through their life cycle.” [Keokuk Daily Gate City, 12/10/20]

2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Restoring Obama Administration Methane Emissions Standards

Miller-Meeks Voted Against Congressional Disapproval Of The Trump Administration’s Methane Rule And Reinstating The Obama Administration’s Methane Emission Standards. In June 2021, Miller-Meeks Voted Against: “Passage of the joint resolution that would provide for congressional disapproval of a September 2020 Environmental Protection Agency rule that reversed 2012 and 2016 rules establishing emission standards -- or new source performance standards -- to limit the amount of methane and volatile organic compounds that can be released in the production, processing, transportation and storage of oil and natural gas. Specifically, the 2020 rule rescinded the methane-specific standards and rescinded the applicability of all standards to transportation and storage activities. The rule also required the EPA, before promulgating new air pollutant standards, to determine that the pollutant causes or contributes significantly to dangerous air pollution. The rule took effect on September 14, 2020. Under the provisions of the joint resolution, the 2020 rule would have no force or effect, and the Obama-era emission standards would be effectively reinstated.” The resolution passed, 229-191. [SJ Res 14, Vote #185, 6/25/21; CQ, 6/25/21]

- In 2016, The EPA Adopted A Rule That Required Oil And Gas Companies To Limit Methane Leaks And Emissions Which Was Later Reversed By The Trump Administration. “This is a really encouraging step because methane is such an important greenhouse gas to reduce,’ Drew Shindell, an earth science professor at Duke University, said of Wednesday’s vote. ‘It sends a signal that the administration is serious about this.’ In 2016, the Environmental Protection Agency adopted a rule requiring oil and gas companies to curb methane leaks and emissions from their operations. Late last summer, the Trump administration undid it.” [Washington Post, 4/28/21]

- The Measure Restored Requirements On Companies To Check Every Six Months For Methane Leaks From Equipment Installed After 2015—And Must Ensure Leaks Are Fixed Within 30 Days Of Being Detected. “If enacted, the measure would restore requirements on companies to check every six months for methane leaks from pipelines, storage tanks and other equipment installed after 2015 — and plug any leak within 30 days after it is detected.” [Washington Post, 4/28/21]

2021: Miller-Meeks Voted For Striking A PAYGO Exemption For Climate Legislation From House Rules

Miller-Meeks Voted For Striking The Rule Exempting Climate Legislation From Spending Caps And Pay-Go Rules From The 2021 House Rules Package. In January 2021, Miller-Meeks voted for a “Smith, R-Mo., motion to recommit the rules package for the 117th Congress to a select committee composed of the majority and minority leaders with instructions to report it back immediately with an amendment that would strike from the resolution a provision that would authorize the House Budget Committee chair to exempt legislation addressing the economic, environmental or public health consequences of climate change from certain budgetary requirements, including discretionary spending caps and pay-as-you-go rules.” The motion was rejected, 203-217. [H. Res. 8, Vote #7, 1/4/21; CQ, 1/4/21]
Miller-Meeks Opposed Cap-And-Trade In 2010

Miller-Meeks: “I Will Oppose The Current Cap And Trade Legislation Because It Will Significantly Hike Energy Costs On Iowa Families And Businesses, And Will Kill Nearly 2 Million Jobs”

Miller-Meeks: “I Will Oppose The Current Cap And Trade Legislation Because It Will Significantly Hike Energy Costs On Iowa Families And Businesses, And Will Kill Nearly 2 Million Jobs.” According to Miller-Meeks for Congress 2010 website under “Oppose Job-Killing Cap-and-Trade”, Miller-Meeks said “I will oppose the current Cap and Trade legislation because it will significantly hike energy costs on Iowa families and businesses, and will kill nearly 2 million jobs, particularly in manufacturing, if enacted. Estimates of the impact on family finances range anywhere from $829 per year up to $3,000, gas prices will increase by 58% and food prices will increase by 20% or more. That’s a policy Iowa simply cannot afford. Unfortunately, Congressman Dave Loebsack sided against Iowa families last summer when he voted YES on cap-and-trade (the bill is pending in the Senate).” [Miller-Meeks for Congress 2010, accessed 6/15/20]

Muscatine Journal: “Miller-Meeks Said The Federal Cap And Trade Bill […] Is Designed To Minimize The Nation’s Dependence On Oil But It Asks Too Much Of Americans As They Work Toward That Goal”

Muscatine Journal: “Miller-Meeks Said The Federal Cap And Trade Bill […] Is Designed To Minimize The Nation’s Dependence On Oil But It Asks Too Much Of Americans As They Work Toward That Goal.” “Miller-Meeks said the Federal Cap and Trade bill that has passed through the House and is on its way to the Senate poses another economic threat for the state. The bill is designed to minimize the nation’s dependence on oil, said Miller-Meeks, but it asks too much of Americans as they work toward that goal. Penalties on coal-fired power plants will impact individual homeowners with electric bills that average $1,200-$2,300 more per year, said Miller-Meeks. She is also concerned that Cap and Trade regulations could also cost more than 30,000 jobs in Iowa if the state puts all its resources into alternative energies and stops using coal, which is less expensive. ‘We can’t afford to penalize Iowans,’ said Miller-Meeks.” [Muscatine Journal, 10/18/10]

Foreign Energy Dependence

2021: Miller-Meeks Criticized Multiple Biden Administration Energy Decisions, Claiming They Would Increase Reliance On Foreign Energy Sources

November 2021: Miller-Meeks Joined A Letter Warning That Tapping The Strategic Petroleum Reserve Would Increase Reliance On Foreign Energy Sources In The Long Run. “Today, November 19th, 2021, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02) joined over 30 of her colleagues, led by Rep. Stephanie Bice (OK-05), in a letter to President Joe Biden and Energy Secretary Jennifer Granholm opposing their plan to tap into the Strategic Petroleum Reserve (SPR) to slow rising fuel costs and address the current energy crisis. ‘For months, Americans have been paying higher prices at the gas pump and the Biden Administration has done little to help them. Instead of supporting an all-around energy plan, the Administration has increased our dependence on foreign energy. Tapping into the emergency reserves like the SPR is not going to help in the long run,’ said Miller-Meeks. ‘We should not be increasing our reliance on foreign energy sources such as Russia, Iran, and Venezuela. These policies have hurt American jobs, workers, and our economy when we should be working around the clock to support them.’” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 11/19/21]

Miller-Meeks Criticized Biden’s Decision To Stop The Keystone Pipeline And Said The Results Were “Eliminating Thousands Of Jobs, And Giving More Power To Foreign Energy Producers.” “I appreciated President Biden’s rhetoric on bringing jobs back to America and I look forward to working with the Administration to do so. But, in the first 100 days, the Biden Administration killed the Keystone XL Pipeline, eliminating thousands of jobs, and giving more power to foreign energy producers.” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 4/29/21]
March 2021: Miller-Meeks Said Investing More Resources In Biofuels Decreased Dependency On Foreign Energy Sources. “Today is #NationalBiodieselDay Iowa plays a critical role in creating this #renewable energy. Investing more resources in #biofuels will not only decrease our dependency on foreign energy sources, it will also support our farmers, rural communities, and boost our economy.” [Twitter, 3/18/21]

2021: Miller-Meeks Said Investing More Resources In Biofuels Decreased Dependency On Foreign Energy Sources

March 2021: Miller-Meeks Said Investing More Resources In Biofuels Decreased Dependency On Foreign Energy Sources. “Today is #NationalBiodieselDay Iowa plays a critical role in creating this #renewable energy. Investing more resources in #biofuels will not only decrease our dependency on foreign energy sources, it will also support our farmers, rural communities, and boost our economy.” [Twitter, 3/18/21]

2013: Miller-Meeks Tweeted Support For Domestic Energy Production

2013: Miller-Meeks Tweeted “We Should Go ‘Canada’ In Past Decade: Lowered Ind & Corporate Taxes, Trade Agreements & Domestic Energy Prod.” “@NPR_Not_Neutral @pdcanada1 We should go ‘Canada’ in past decade: lowered ind & corporate taxes, trade agreements & domestic energy prod” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 2/23/13]

Department Of Energy

2020: Miller-Meeks Said The Departments Of Energy And Homeland Security Could Be Reduced

2020: Miller-Meeks Said The Departments Of Energy And Homeland Security Could Be Reduced. “Scheinblum asked the candidates what agency or governmental department they would reform or eliminate, if elected. [...] Miller-Meeks also said education should be left to states to manage. She said the Departments of Energy and Homeland Security could be reduced.” [Muscatine Journal, 7/2/20]

Electric & Hybrid Vehicles

2021: Miller-Meeks Criticized The Inclusion Of Funding For Electric Vehicle Car Charging In The Infrastructure Package, Calling It “Misplaced”

Miller-Meeks: Having “More Money Going Into Electric Vehicle Car Charging Stations Than You Have Roads And Bridges” Was “Misplaced When You're Developing A Policy Package For Infrastructure.” NIEDLEMAN: “So, where do you stand on building a green energy infrastructure?” [...] MILLER-MEEKS: “So, I think that we can move forward on green energy. But when you have more money going into electric vehicle car charging stations than you have roads and bridges, it seems to me that that, you know, that’s a little bit misplaced when you're developing a policy package for infrastructure. So, that would be one of the things I would look at.” [YouTube, Local 4 News WHBF, 6/20/21] (VIDEO)

2021: Miller-Meeks Said She Was “Shocked That Anyone Would Suggest That Purchasing An Electric Vehicle Would Help Consumers With Transportation Costs”

Miller-Meeks Said She Was “Shocked That Anyone Would Suggest That Purchasing An Electric Vehicle Would Help Consumers With Transportation Costs.” “In fact, the cost of consumer goods has risen so much that purchasing an electric vehicle is impossible for a majority of American families. According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics’ Consumer Price Index, the cost of new vehicles has increased 9.8 percent since last year, and
for those looking to save money by purchasing a used vehicle, they are looking at a 26.4 percent increase in cost. Along with the exorbitant cost of an electric vehicle, I am also shocked that anyone would suggest that purchasing an electric vehicle would help consumers with transportation costs. The cost of electricity has increased 6.5 percent, with data showing the average electric vehicle costs more to power in 2021 than a combustion engine car that gets reasonable gas mileage. Even the automotive industry leaders believe that suggestions for families to immediately transition to electric vehicles is ‘beyond the limits’ of what the industry can sustain. Vehicle costs are already rising and a supply shortage will only add to this crisis.” [Iowa Torch, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks Op-Ed, 12/7/21]

2021: Miller-Meeks Offered Higher Hybrid Vehicle Registration Fees As An Option For Funding Infrastructure Projects Like Road Work Traditionally Funded By Fuel Taxes

Miller-Meeks: “I Would Be Glad To Pay A Higher Registration Fee For My Hybrid Vehicle To Help Pay” For Infrastructure Projects. “Miller-Meeks said the infrastructure needs are clear, but the source of cash to pay for the work is less so. ‘The question is, how do we pay for that? We know that with electric vehicles and hybrid vehicles, our road-use tax revenues have decreased,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘Our state in fact increased its fuel tax several years ago to try to adjust and adapt for that. I would be glad to pay a higher registration fee for my hybrid vehicle to help pay’ for infrastructure projects, she added. Governments have struggled as Americans drive less, or drive more-efficient vehicles. That means they buy less fuel, and pay less taxes that traditionally have paid for road work. ‘I think we all know that our bridges, our locks on the Mississippi River, our dams, our highways’ need work, Miller-Meeks said. ‘Some of our roads in Ottumwa are terrible.’ Congress needs to pass an infrastructure bill covering five to 10 years of projects, possibly paid for by an increase in the federal fuel tax, Miller-Meeks said. At the same time, the federal government should back research into how to make roads last longer, she added.” [Iowa Capital Dispatch, 9/10/20]

September 2020: Miller-Meeks Said Higher Hybrid Vehicle Registration Fees Were An Option For Funding Infrastructure Projects Like Road Work Traditionally Funded By Fuel Taxes. “Miller-Meeks said the infrastructure needs are clear, but the source of cash to pay for the work is less so. ‘The question is, how do we pay for that? We know that with electric vehicles and hybrid vehicles, our road-use tax revenues have decreased,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘Our state in fact increased its fuel tax several years ago to try to adjust and adapt for that. I would be glad to pay a higher registration fee for my hybrid vehicle to help pay’ for infrastructure projects, she added. Governments have struggled as Americans drive less, or drive more-efficient vehicles. That means they buy less fuel, and pay less taxes that traditionally have paid for road work. ‘I think we all know that our bridges, our locks on the Mississippi River, our dams, our highways’ need work, Miller-Meeks said. ‘Some of our roads in Ottumwa are terrible.’ Congress needs to pass an infrastructure bill covering five to 10 years of projects, possibly paid for by an increase in the federal fuel tax, Miller-Meeks said. At the same time, the federal government should back research into how to make roads last longer, she added.” [Iowa Capital Dispatch, 9/10/20]

2019: Miller-Meeks Voted For Imposing Electric Vehicle Taxes And Fees

2019: Miller-Meeks Voted For Imposing Electric Vehicle Taxes And Fees. Miller-Meeks voted for HF 767, “a bill for an act relating to motor vehicle taxes and fees, including registration fees for certain electric vehicles, an excise tax on hydrogen used as special fuel, and an excise tax on electricity used as electric fuel, providing penalties, making penalties applicable, and including effective date provisions.” The bill passed by vote 34-14. [Iowa State Legislature, HF 767, 4/27/19]

Public Lands

2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against A Bill Designating Nearly 1.5 Million Acres Of Federal Lands As New, Expanded, Or Potential Wilderness Areas

February 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Passage Of The Protecting America’s Wilderness And Public Lands Act, Which Designated Nearly 1.5 Million Acres Of Federal Lands As New, Expanded, Or Potential
**Wilderness Areas.** In February 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against: “Passage of the bill, as amended, that would designate nearly 1.5 million acres of federal lands in California, Colorado, and Washington as new, expanded, or potential wilderness areas -- including approximately 626,000 acres in California, approximately 733,000 acres in Colorado and approximately 132,000 acres in Washington -- and designate more than 1,200 river miles in Northern California and the Washington Olympic Peninsula as wild, scenic or recreational rivers. It would designate over 1.2 million acres of additional federal lands in California as restoration, recreation, and other protected areas; expand or establish a number of National Park System monuments, recreation areas and other lands in California and Colorado; and effectively prohibit new mining or mineral production activities by withdrawing mineral and geothermal leasing rights for a number of federal lands, including approximately 1 million acres in the Grand Canyon region of Arizona and approximately 200,000 acres within the Thompson Divide in Colorado. Among other provisions, the bill would establish a public-private partnership -- made up of federal, state, and local government officials, and private stakeholders -- to facilitate environmental remediation of federal lands and waters in California damaged by illegal marijuana operations. It would preserve a number of existing rights and usages on designated lands, such as low-level helicopter operations and high altitude training by the military. As amended, it would establish a formal system for designation and management of National Heritage Areas; reauthorize the Cape Cod National Seashore Advisory Commission for 10 years; and designate or require studies on additional lands in several other states, including to expand two national monuments in Arizona and establish the island of St. Croix in the Virgin Islands as a National Heritage Area.” The bill passed by a vote of 227 – 200. [HR 803, Vote #45, 2/26/21; CQ, 2/26/21]

**Energy Infrastructure**


March 2021: Miller-Meeks Wrote An Op-Ed In Support Of Investing In Power Grid Infrastructure Following A Weather-Related Energy Crisis In Texas. “While generation sources like wind, solar, coal and natural gas have grabbed the headlines, the underlying infrastructure and transmission framework are often forgotten. While it is true that renewables, including wind, failed, the truth is, the Texas energy grid failed at many levels. From generation (including coal, wind, and natural gas), to transmission to water, the failure reached catastrophic proportions and unfortunately led to the loss of life. In contrast, Iowa weathered the cold because of winterized generation equipment and participation in a regional transmission organization like MISO that can facilitate power-sharing across a wide multistate footprint. Our state benefited from a diversified energy portfolio, along with grid expertise that knew how to manage it during drastic weather. Our wind turbines continued to perform, along with other generation sources, to ensure the lights and heat stayed on during the subzero temperatures. The Texas disaster underscores the need for a diversified generation portfolio. This includes energy efficiency, as energy demand reached historic heights due to the heating needs.” [Southeast Iowa Union, Miller-Meeks Op-Ed, 3/24/21]

Miller-Meeks Called For Investment In Energy Storage Technology And Emerging Generation Technologies Such As Biogas And Community Solar. “States need a mix of cost-competitive energy sources, including wind and solar so we can capitalize on low fuel costs and provide more local distribution. The grid of the future, however, demands more. We also will need to focus on technology like energy storage for all generation sources and responsible energy-efficiency programs. Meeting the ever-increasing energy demands will call for emerging generation technologies such as biogas, community solar, and more distributed resources. Coupled with increased investments in transmission infrastructure and more collaboration between grid operators, our energy grid will be more resilient and reliable in the face of natural disasters.” [Southeast Iowa Union, Miller-Meeks Op-Ed, 3/24/21]
March 2021: Miller-Meeks Called For Diversifying Energy Sources And Powering Iowa’s Economy With “Biofuels, Ethanol, Wind, Solar, And Biogas.” “The recent cold weather proved that Iowa has made smart investments in its energy plans. But we can’t stop here, there is more work to be done to ensure we can keep the lights on for all Iowans. States need a mix of cost-competitive energy sources, including wind and solar so we can capitalize on low fuel costs and provide more local distribution. The grid of the future, however, demands more. We also will need to focus on technology like energy storage for all generation sources and responsible energy-efficiency programs. Meeting the ever-increasing energy demands will call for emerging generation technologies such as biogas, community solar, and more distributed resources. Coupled with increased investments in transmission infrastructure and more collaboration between grid operators, our energy grid will be more resilient and reliable in the face of natural disasters. By harnessing our natural resources for both energy and fuel, renewables can truly power Iowa’s economy. Biofuels, ethanol, wind, solar, and biogas provide a ripple of economic impact throughout our state.” [Southeast Iowa Union, Miller-Meeks Op-Ed, 3/24/21]

Miller-Meeks: “By Harnessing Our Natural Resources For Both Energy And Fuel, Renewables Can Truly Power Iowa’s Economy.” “States need a mix of cost-competitive energy sources, including wind and solar so we can capitalize on low fuel costs and provide more local distribution. The grid of the future, however, demands more. We also will need to focus on technology like energy storage for all generation sources and responsible energy-efficiency programs. Meeting the ever-increasing energy demands will call for emerging generation technologies such as biogas, community solar, and more distributed resources. Coupled with increased investments in transmission infrastructure and more collaboration between grid operators, our energy grid will be more resilient and reliable in the face of natural disasters. By harnessing our natural resources for both energy and fuel, renewables can truly power Iowa’s economy. Biofuels, ethanol, wind, solar, and biogas provide a ripple of economic impact throughout our state.” [Southeast Iowa Union, Miller-Meeks Op-Ed, 3/24/21]

2020: Cedar Rapids Gazette Gave Miller-Meeks’ Claim That 40% Of Iowa’s Energy Resources Were From Renewable Sources An “A” Rating

October 2020: Cedar Rapids Gazette Gave Miller-Meeks’ Claim That 40% Of Iowa’s Energy Resources Were From Renewable Sources An “A” Rating. “In this check, we'll hit on two debate claims from Miller-Meeks, an ophthalmologist and state senator. […] 'Forty percent of our (Iowa's) energy resources are from renewables.' The U.S. Energy Information Administration reported in May that Iowa gets 42 percent of its net electric generation from wind. Another 2 percent comes from biomass, solar and hydroelectric power. Grade: A” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 10/26/20]

Miller-Meeks Called For Investments In Community Solar, But Raised Concerns That Expanding Solar Energy Would Take Up Usable Farmland

Miller-Meeks Said One Of Her Biggest Reservations About Expanding Solar Energy Was Taking Up Good Farmland To Install Solar Farms. “Miller-Meeks said one of her biggest reservations about broadening the use of solar energy is taking up good farmland to install solar farms. But Miller-Meeks said she is proud of the strides Iowa has made with renewable energy. ‘When I say that 40% of our electricity in Iowa is from renewables, that shocks people,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘They're not aware that we have that much renewable energy in Iowa, between solar, wind, biodiesel and ethanol.’” [Kalona News, 6/9/21]

Miller-Meeks Called For Investment In Energy Storage Technology And Emerging Generation Technologies Such As Biogas And Community Solar. “States need a mix of cost-competitive energy sources, including wind and solar so we can capitalize on low fuel costs and provide more local distribution. The grid of the future, however, demands more. We also will need to focus on technology like energy storage for all generation sources and responsible energy-efficiency programs. Meeting the ever-increasing energy demands will call for emerging...
generation technologies such as biogas, community solar, and more distributed resources. Coupled with increased investments in transmission infrastructure and more collaboration between grid operators, our energy grid will be more resilient and reliable in the face of natural disasters.” [Southeast Iowa Union, Miller-Meeks Op-Ed, 3/24/21]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miller-Meeks Supported Production Of Alternative Energy Sources Such As Wind And Hydroelectric Plants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Miller-Meeks Supported Production Of Alternative Energy Sources Such As Wind And Hydroelectric Plants.** “She said the Iowa Second District has a good start in alternative energy. The Siemens plant in Fort Madison and a wind plant in Cedar Rapids are taking advantage of wind power. Of course Keokuk has had the hydroelectric plant for many years and we have biodiesel and ethanol plants as well.” [Daily Democrat, 5/1/08]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wildfires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| 2021: Miller-Meeks Tweeted That “Science Shows And Experts Say That Proper And Active Forest Management Significantly Reduces The Likelihood Of Wildfires” |

**Miller-Meeks: “The Science Shows And Experts Say That Proper And Active Forest Management Significantly Reduces The Likelihood Of Wildfires.”** “I agree with @CongMikeSimpson, @RepRussFulcher, and @RepNewhouse. The science shows and experts say that proper and active forest management significantly reduces the likelihood of wildfires. @westerncaucus” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 9/15/21]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nuclear Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Miller-Meeks Supported Iowa Using Nuclear Power |

**Miller-Meeks Supported Iowa Using Nuclear Power.** “She said the state could use nuclear power too. The state also is becoming a leader in biotechnology, creating items like Asoya, oil from soybeans and working on oil from algae. Even the state’s garbage can help provide energy. Several waste authorities are looking at methane collecting from their landfills. The government can push these technologies along by creating programs to help perpetuate them or by removing some restraint.” [Daily Democrat, 5/1/08]

**Miller-Meeks Supported Embracing Nuclear Energy.** “Miller-Meeks said she wants to see an environmental policy that is good for the planet while not crippling the Midwest economy. ‘Without increasing the efficiency of our energy sources, we cap our prosperity and trade our future,’ Miller-Meeks said. She suggested that proceeding without an energy plan and without embracing nuclear energy or recapturing heat from coal-fired plants will delay economic recovery.” [The Hawk Eye, 12/1/09]
## Equal Rights & Workplace Fairness

### Significant Findings

- **2021:** Miller-Meeks voted against the Paycheck Fairness Act, a bill aimed at eliminating the gender pay gap, claiming it would leave businesses with “an onslaught of frivolous lawsuits.”
  - Miller-Meeks voted for an amendment creating a loophole for employers who faced legal consequences for discrimination.
  - Women in Iowa made 78.1 cents for every dollar made by men.
- **2021:** Miller-Meeks voted against the Equality Act, which would prohibit discrimination based on sex, sexual orientation, and gender identity.
- **2021:** Miller-Meeks voted against reversing a Trump administration rule that had increased EEOC reporting requirements and compromised victim and witness confidentiality.
- **2021:** Miller-Meeks voted against the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act, a bill increasing protections against age discrimination in the workplace.
- **2021:** Miller-Meeks voted against the Protect Older Job Applicants Act.
- **2021:** Miller-Meeks voted against removing the deadline for ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment.
- **2021:** Miller-Meeks voted for protections for pregnant and breastfeeding workers.

### Equal Pay


**2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Paycheck Fairness Act.** In April 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against: “Passage of the bill that would narrow the legal defense an employer may use in a lawsuit alleging pay discrimination on the basis of sex. Specifically, it would require employers to demonstrate that a difference in pay between employees is based on a business-related ‘bona fide factor other than sex, such as education, training, or experience’ as opposed to being based on ‘any factor other than sex.’ It would prohibit employers from retaliating against employees involved in lawsuits under fair labor standards law; prohibit employers from relying on a prospective employee's wage history for hiring or wage determinations; increase employers' liability for compensatory or punitive damages related to pay discrimination violations; and provide for automatic inclusion of all affected individuals in class action lawsuits related to pay discrimination. Among other provisions, the bill would authorize a new Labor Department grant program for public and private entities to carry out negotiation skills training programs to address pay disparities. It would establish an annual national award for an employer that made a ‘substantial effort to eliminate pay disparities between men and women.’ It would require the Labor Department to conduct a number of studies on sex-based pay disparities and require the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to collect compensation data disaggregated by employees' sex, race and national origin. It would require the Labor Department and EEOC to provide technical assistance for small businesses to comply with
the bill’s provisions. It would add a definition of ‘sex’ with respect to federal fair labor standards law, which would include sexual orientation or gender identity.” According to CNBC, the Paycheck Fairness Act “aims to eliminate the gender pay gap and strengthen workplace protections for women.” The bill passed 217 to 210. [HR 7, Vote #108, 4/15/21; CQ, 4/15/21; CNBC, 4/16/21]

- **The Paycheck Fairness Act Aimed “To Eliminate The Gender Pay Gap And Strengthen Workplace Protections For Women.”** “The Paycheck Fairness Act, which aims to eliminate the gender pay gap and strengthen workplace protections for women, passed the House of Representatives on Thursday in a 217-210 vote […] Biden added that a full passage of the Paycheck Fairness Act by Congress would address the wage gap by ‘closing loopholes that have allowed employers to justify gender pay disparities, strengthening provisions for holding employers accountable for systemic pay discrimination, and helping level the playing field for women and people of color by making it easier for workers to challenge pay disparities as a group. Additionally, he said the Paycheck Fairness Act would make it illegal for employers to ask employees about their salary history in the hiring process and promote pay transparency by requiring more employers to report pay data to the government. Right now, at least 18 states already have laws in place that ban employers from asking about salary history.” [CNBC, 4/16/21]

**Miller-Meeks: “H.R.7 Will Force America’s Businesses To Prepare For An Onslaught Of Frivolous Lawsuits.”** “But the bill faces an uncertain fate in the Senate, after passing the House with virtually zero Republican support. Republicans argue the bill does more harm than good. ‘H.R.7 will force America’s businesses to prepare for an onslaught of frivolous lawsuits,’ said Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, R-Iowa. A small business owner herself, Miller-Meeks says the bill's penalties could harm businesses already vulnerable because of the pandemic.” [CBS 11 WJHL, 4/16/21]

**Miller-Meeks Voted For An Amendment To The Paycheck Fairness Act Creating A Loophole For Employers Who Faced Legal Action For Discrimination**

**Miller-Meeks Voted For An Amendment Granting A “Safe Harbor” For Employers Facing Legal Action For Pay Discrimination If They Took “Reasonable Steps” To Correct The Disparities.** In April 2021, Miller-Meeks voted for: “Miller-Meeks, R-Iowa, for Stefanik, R-N.Y., substitute amendment no. 4 that would, among other provisions, provide a safe harbor such that employers would not be liable in legal action related to pay discrimination if the employer conducted a voluntary audit of its pay practices within the previous three years and took ‘reasonable steps’ to correct any compensation disparities found by the audit that may have violated fair labor law. It would prohibit employers from requesting or relying on the wage history of a prospective employee for consideration of employment, unless a prospective employee voluntarily discloses such information. It would make it unlawful for employers to prohibit employees from inquiring about, discussing or disclosing wages but allow employers to limit the time, place and circumstances during which employees may do so.” The amendment was rejected 183 to 244. [HR 7, Vote #107, 4/15/21; CQ, 4/15/21]

**Women In Iowa Made 78.1 Cents For Every Dollar Made By Men**

Women In Iowa Made 78.1 Cents For Every Dollar Made By Men. [National Women’s Law Center, accessed 1/12/22]

**Equality Act**

**2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Equality Act, Which Would Prohibit Discrimination Based On Sex, Sexual Orientation, And Gender Identity**

Miller-Meeks Voted Against Passage Of The Equality Act, Which Would Prohibit Discrimination Or Segregation Based On Sex, Sexual Orientation And Gender Identity. In February 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against: “Passage of the bill that would prohibit discrimination or segregation based on sex, sexual orientation and
gender identity under 1964 Civil Rights Act protections, including in public facilities, public education, federal assistance programs, employment, jury service and areas of public accommodation. It would expand the definition of "public accommodations" to include transportation services and any establishment providing a good, service or program -- including retailers, health care facilities and legal services. The bill would define "gender identity" as "gender-related identity, appearance, mannerisms or other gender-related characteristics of an individual," regardless of designated sex at birth. It would also allow the Justice Department to intervene in equal protection cases regarding sexual orientation and gender identity.” The bill passed 224-206. [HR 5, Vote #39, 2/25/21; CQ, 2/25/21]

- **The Equality Act Would Prohibit Discrimination On The Basis Of Sexual Orientation And Gender Identity.** “The House passed sweeping legislation on Friday that would prohibit discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity. […] The legislation, which amends the Civil Rights Act of 1964, prohibits discrimination of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people in both the public and private sectors, offering civil rights protections in businesses, hospitals and welfare services. It explicitly states that individuals cannot be denied access to a locker room or dressing room on the same basis.” [New York Times, 5/17/19]

### Equal Employment Opportunity Commission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Reversing A Trump Administration Rule That Had Increased EEOC Reporting Requirements And Compromised Victim And Witness Confidentiality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Miller-Meeks Voted Against Reversing A Trump Administration Rule That Changed What Information The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Would Share With Companies Accused Of Discrimination.** In June 2021, Miller-Meeks Voted Against: “Passage of the joint resolution that would provide for congressional disapproval of a January 2021 rule modifying requirements for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission conciliation process, by which the agency is required to attempt to settle unfair employment practice claims with an employer prior to taking legal action against the employer, including through an agreement that the employer will eliminate the practice and provide affirmative relief. The rule went into effect on Feb. 16, 2021, and requires the EEOC to present employers with certain information related to a claim, including to provide a written summary of the legal basis for its determination that there is reasonable cause to believe an unlawful practice occurred; identify individuals who filed the claim unless they requested anonymity; and explain its decision-making related to the basis for affirmative relief and the legal designation for the case. Under the provisions of the joint resolution, the January 2021 rule would have no force or effect.” The resolution passed, 219-210. [SJ Res 13, Vote #183, 6/24/21; CQ, 6/24/21]

- **The Trump Administration Rule Required The EEOC To Provide Information To Employers When Initiating A Settlement Process Including A Summary Of The Case Facts, Identities Of Witnesses And Victims, And The Legal Basis For Discrimination Findings.** “The January rule would have required the EEOC to provide information to employers upon initiating the settlement, or "conciliation," process, including a summary of the facts of a case, the identities of witnesses and alleged victims, and the legal basis for a finding that discrimination has occurred. The Republican-led commission said the changes would encourage settlements by allowing employers to weigh the merits of bias complaints early on in the process.” [Reuters, 7/1/21]

- **Opponents Of The Rule Argued That It Diverted Limited EEOC Resources Away From Combating Discrimination And Delayed Cases And Increased The Risk Of Employer Retaliation.** “But many Democrats and worker advocates said it would divert the EEOC's limited resources away from combating discrimination and delay cases, including by creating a new avenue for time-consuming appeals. In a statement issued last month, the White House criticized the rule's 'onerous and rigid new procedures,' and said it would increase the risk of retaliation against workers who file complaints or participate in discrimination investigations.” [Reuters, 7/1/21]
Age Discrimination

2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act, A Bill Increasing Protections Against Age Discrimination In The Workplace

Miller-Meeks Voted Against Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act Of 2021. In June 2021, Miller-Meeks Voted Against: “Passage of the bill, as amended, that would specify a that adverse actions by an employer in which age was a motivating factor shall be considered unlawful under federal employment law regarding age discrimination. It would specify that a complaining party under such law would not be required to demonstrate that age was the sole motivating factor of an adverse action, thus effectively reversing the 2009 Supreme Court decision in Gross v. FBL Financial Services, Inc. It would establish the same standard of proof in the case of employment discrimination based on disability or retaliation against an employee who opposes unlawful employment practices or participates in investigations or litigations related to such practices. In age-based employment discrimination cases where a court determines that an adverse action would have been taken in the absence of age-based motivation, the bill would allow courts to grant declaratory or injunctive relief and attorneys fees, but prohibit courts from awarding damages or ordering reparative actions by the respondent. As ammended, it would require the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to submit reports to Congress on the number of age discrimination in employment claims brought under the bill’s provisions; disparities faced by individuals with characteristics protected under existing anti-discrimination law in pursuing employment discrimination relief under the mixed-motive evidentiary standard; and the number of pending or filed claims by women impacted by age-based employment discrimination.” The bill passed, 247-178. [HR 2062, Vote #180, 6/23/21; CQ, 6/23/21]

2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Protect Older Job Applicants Act

November 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against A Bill To Prohibit Employers From Discriminating Against Job Applicants Based On Age. On November 4, 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against the “Passage of the bill, as amended, that would prohibit an employer from discriminating against a job applicant in a way that would deprive the job applicant of employment opportunities or otherwise adversely affect the applicant’s status based on the applicant's age.” The bill passed by a vote of 224-200. [H.R. 3992, Vote 358, 11/4/21; CQ, 11/4/21]


November 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against An Amendment To Conduct A Study On The Extent Of Age Discrimination Claims, And Then Voted For A Study On Discrimination Claims’ Impact That Would Delay Implementation Of Any Protections

Miller-Meeks Voted Against A Study On The Extent Of Age Discrimination Claims, And Then Voted For A Study On Discrimination Claims’ Impact That Would Delay Implementation Of Any Protections

November 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted For An Amendment To Delay The Effective Date Of The Protect Older Job Applicants Act Until A Study Was Conducted On Whether Allowing Applicants To File Disparate Impact Claims Had A Negative Impact On Such Applicants. On November 4, 2021, Miller-Meeks voted for the “Keller, R-Pa., amendment no. 2 that would delay the bill's effective date until the Government Accountability Office conducts a study and reports to Congress on whether not allowing job applicants to file disparate impact claims has a negative impact on such applicants. It would stipulate that the bill's provisions would not take effect if the study shows there is not a significant negative impact on such applicants.” The amendment was rejected by a vote of 197-228. [H.R. 3992, Vote 357, 11/4/21; CQ, 11/4/21]

November 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against An Amendment To Conduct A Study On Job Applicants’ Age Discrimination Claims. On November 4, 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against the “Pappas, D-N.H., amendment no. 1 that would require the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to conduct a study, within one enactment, to
determine the number of pending or filed claims, including claims in closed cases, by individuals who may have been adversely impacted by age discrimination in the job application process. It would require the commission to submit to Congress and make publicly available a report on study results including recommendations for best practices to address age discrimination in the hiring process.” The amendment was adopted by a vote of 225-201. [H.R. 3992, Vote 356, 11/4/21; CQ, 11/4/21]

**Equal Rights Amendment**

### 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Removing The Deadline For Ratification Of The Equal Rights Amendment

Miller-Meeks Voted Against Removing The Deadline For Ratification Of The Equal Rights Amendment. In March 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against: “Passage of the joint resolution that would remove the deadline for ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution, which would state that "equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex." The ERA was proposed to the states in 1972, with a seven-year deadline for ratification, which was subsequently extended through June 1982. The joint resolution would make the proposed constitutional amendment valid as part of the Constitution whenever ratified by three-fourths of the states.” The resolution passed by a vote of 222-204. [H J Res 17, Vote #82, 3/17/21; CQ, 3/17/21]

**Paid Leave**

### June 2021: Miller-Meeks Sponsored A Bill Adjusting How Employers Were Able To Offer Paid Leave To Employees In Flexible Work Arrangements, Claiming It Would Prevent A “Burdensome” Federal Paid Leave Mandate

June 2021: Miller-Meeks Sponsored A Bill Adjusting How Employers Were Able To Offer Paid Leave To Employees In Flexible Work Arrangements. On June 30, 2021, Miller-Meeks sponsored HR 4248, the Workflex in the 21st Century Act, which would “amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to include a voluntary option for qualified flexible workplace arrangements.” The bill was read twice and referred to House Education and Labor. [HR 4248, Sponsored, 6/30/21; CQ, 6/30/21]

- **Miller-Meeks Said The Bill “Encourages And Allows Employers To Implement Paid Leave Programs And Flexible Work Arrangements Voluntarily Without The Need For A Burdensome And Inflexible One-Size-Fits-All Federal Mandate.”** “Today, June 30th, 2021, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02) introduced H.R. 4248, the Workflex in the 21st Century Act. This legislation encourages and allows employers to implement paid leave programs and flexible work arrangements voluntarily without the need for a burdensome and inflexible one-size-fits-all federal mandate. Miller-Meeks introduced this legislation with Reps. Virginia Foxx (NC-05), Cathy McMorris Rodgers (WA-05), Tim Walberg (MI-07), and Glenn Thompson (PA-15). ‘In this day and age, hard-working Americans across the country should have access to work scheduling options to better help them meet their family and work needs. Employers and employees need flexibility, not mandates and regulations,’ said Miller-Meeks. ‘My Workflex in the 21st Century Act would ensure that American workers have access to flexible paid leave policies, while providing certainty to businesses. This bill would provide more paid leave for employees than all state paid leave laws, and I am proud to introduce it today.”” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 6/30/21]

**September 2020: Miller-Meeks Said The Country Should Consider Allowing Employees To Finance Family Or Medical Leave By Borrowing Against The Employee’s 401(k)**

September 2020: Miller-Meeks Said The Country Should Consider Allowing Employees To Finance Family Or Medical Leave By Borrowing Against The Employee’s 401(k). “Borrowing against 401(k) for
family/medical leave: Miller-Meeks said the country should consider giving employers the option to finance family or medical leave through borrowing against the employee's 401(k). Hart opposed this concept.” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 9/28/20]

### Pregnancy & Breastfeeding

#### 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted For The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act

Miller-Meeks Voted For Passage Of The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act, Requiring Public Employers And Private Employers With At Least 15 Employees “To Make Reasonable Accommodations To Employees For Known Limitations Related To Pregnancy.” In May 2021, Miller-Meeks voted for: “Passage of the bill that would require public employers and private employers with at least 15 employees to make reasonable accommodations to employees for known limitations related to pregnancy, childbirth or related medical conditions, unless the employer demonstrates that such accommodations would impose an undue hardship on their operations. It would prohibit employers from denying employment opportunities to or retaliating against such employees based on the need to provide accommodations. It would prohibit employers from requiring such employees to take paid or unpaid leave if reasonable accommodations can be provided or to accept any accommodation other than a reasonable accommodation arrived at through an interactive process between the employer and employee. It would also provide legal remedies for employees denied reasonable accommodations, including rights to compensatory damages, lost pay and reasonable attorney fees, and it would require the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, within two years of enactment, to issue regulations to carry out the bill's provisions, including to provide examples of reasonable accommodations for pregnant workers.” The bill passed 315 to 101. [H R 1065, Vote #143, 5/14/21; CQ, 5/14/21]

#### 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted For Expanding Requirements To Allow Employees To Pump Breast Milk At Work

October 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted For A Bill To Expand Requirements For Employers To Provide Breaks For Employees To Pump Breast Milk And Allow Employees To Seek Restitution For Violations Of Such Requirements. On October 22, 2021, Miller-Meeks voted for the “Passage of the bill, as amended, that would expand requirements for employers to provide breaks for employees to pump breast milk and allow employees to seek restitution for violations of such requirements. Specifically, the bill would require all employers to provide reasonable breaks as needed and a private place other than a bathroom for employees to express breast milk for a period of two years after such need arises. It would specify that employers would not be required to compensate employees for break time provided unless otherwise required by federal, state or local law. It would specify that break time would be considered hours worked if the employee is not completely relieved from duty during the entirety of the break. It would establish an effective date of 120 days after enactment and require the Labor Department, within 60 days of enactment, to issue guidance with respect to employer compliance. In seeking legal remedy against an employer that does not comply with the bill's requirements, it would generally require the employee to inform the employer and give them 10 days to provide accommodations prior to commencing legal action. It would provide an undue hardship exemption for employers of fewer than 50 employees. For air carriers, it would establish a separate effective date of one year after enactment; specify that accommodations would not have to completely relieve crewmembers from duty during in-flight breaks or provide breaks during critical phases of flight; and require the Federal Aviation Administration to propose regulations identifying appropriate means for air carrier compliance and updating federal law to ensure that expressing breast milk is considered a "physiological need."” The bill passed by a vote of 276-149. [H.R. 3110, Vote #331, 10/22/21; CQ, 10/22/21]

#### 2021: Miller-Meeks Introduced A Bill She Said Would Amend The Fair Labor Standards Act To Expand Access To Breastfeeding At Work

introduced H.R. 4297, the Supporting Working Mothers Act. This legislation would amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to expand access to nursing accommodations in the workplace, without placing one-size-fits-all mandates on all employers. ‘Nursing mothers deserve reasonable accommodations in the workplace. I have two children and I worked full time when they were infants,’ said Miller-Meeks. ‘My Supporting Working Mothers Act would provide reasonable break time and accommodations for breastfeeding mothers, without burdening businesses. I am proud to introduce this commonsense legislation.’’’ [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 7/1/21]
FEMA & Disaster Relief Issues

Significant Findings

✓ September 2021: Miller-Meeks voted against a short-term government funding extension that included $28.6 billion for natural disaster relief.

✓ 2020: Miller-Meeks thanked Trump for his emergency response to the 2020 Midwest derecho.

✓ 2008: Miller-Meeks said Congress needed to modify laws that forbid cities and counties from utilizing people who already have disaster recovery skills.

✓ 2008: Miller-Meeks blamed the media for spending more time on Hurricane Katrina than it had on a recent Iowa flood, which made members of Congress fail to see the pressing need in Iowa.

Disaster Relief

Sep. 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Extending Government Funding Through December 3, 2021. On September 30, 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against the “DeLauro, D-Conn., motion to concur in the Senate amendment to the bill that would provide funding for federal government operations and services through Dec. 3, 2021, at fiscal 2021 levels and provide emergency funding for natural disaster relief and Afghan evacuee assistance.” The motion was agreed to by a vote of 254-175. [CQ, 9/30/21; HR 5305, Vote 311, 9/30/21]

• Short-Term Government Funding Extension Included $28.6 Billion For Natural Disaster Relief. “It would provide $28.6 billion in supplemental appropriations for natural disaster relief, including $10 billion for the Agriculture Department to cover agricultural losses; $5.7 billion for Army Corps of Engineers flood and storm damage response; $5 billion for disaster-related community development block grants; $2.6 billion to reimburse states and territories for damage to roads and bridges; $1.36 billion for the Forest Service and $636 million for the Interior Department, including for wildfire response; $1.2 billion for Small Business Administration disaster loans; $895 million for Navy and Air Force facility repairs; $345 million for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, including $200 million for fishery disaster response; and $22 million for the National Institute of Standards and Technology to investigate building collapses.” [CQ, 9/30/21]

Midwest Derecho 2020

February 2021: Miller-Meeks Said She Supported Rep. Feenstra’s “Derecho Disaster Relief Amendment” To The American Rescue Plan. “Today, February 27th, 2021, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02) released the following statement after voting NO on H.R. 1319, the budget reconciliation package. ‘I am disappointed that all Republican amendments, including Rep. Feenstra’s bipartisan derecho disaster relief amendment, were blocked from this $1.9 trillion bill. With almost $1 trillion of previous bipartisan funding packages remaining unspent and now over a trillion in new funds only tangentially related to the COVID pandemic; it is unacceptable that less than 1/2 of 1% of the total funds in this bill will go to fund local and state public health workers. Additionally, roughly 9% of the funds are going to vaccines, testing, and contact tracing, which is simply not enough.’” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 2/27/21]

• Miller-Meeks Said She Supported Rep. Feenstra’s Amendment To “Make Systems Available To Producers Who Suffered Disaster Losses In 2020.” “And while I’m here today I’d also like to state my unquestioned support for an amendment offered by another fellow Iowan, Congressman Randy Feenstra. Last
year, as Representative Ashley Hinson described, we saw devastating natural disasters across the country that impacted the work of our nations’ farmers. Iowa farmers were hit particularly hard by the derecho, or inland hurricane, storm, and are still working to recover their losses. Representative Feenstra’s bipartisan amendment would make systems available to producers who suffered disaster losses in 2020. This bipartisan amendment would not only help Iowans, but also producers in states harmed by wildfires, such as California and Oregon, and drought, like we saw in New Mexico and Texas. […] His amendment was bipartisan, commonsense, and would not increase the cost of this bill in any way.” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 2/26/21] (VIDEO) 00:01:30

- **Miller-Meeks Tweeted Her Support For Rep. Feenstra’s Disaster Relief Funding Amendment.**
  “@RepFeenstra’s bipartisan amendment at @HouseAgGOP was one of TWO Republican-led amendments that were not blocked, and now there are plans to remove it at the last minute. Last summer’s derecho devasted Iowa farmers, and we must continue to support them. #iowaag” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 2/24/21]

- **Rep. Feenstra’s Amendment Was Removed By Speaker Nancy Pelosi Before The Relief Bill Passed The House 219-212.** Early Saturday morning, the U.S. House passed a $1.9 trillion pandemic relief bill 219-212 allowing it to progress to the Senate. […] While in the House, Feenstra proposed an amendment to the bill that would include $4 billion for derecho victims, which was removed by Speaker Dancy [sic] Pelosi. On Friday evening, Feenstra took to Twitter to voice his frustration. ‘I’m extremely disappointed that House Democrats have voted to turn their backs on (Iowa) farmers by voting to ax derecho relief,’ Feenstra wrote.” [KCCI 8 Des Moines, 2/27/21]

- **Rep. Feenstra’s Amendment Had Been Adopted By The House Agriculture Committee 24-23 And Would “Provide Relief For Producers Who Were Impacted By Natural Disasters In 2020.”** “On Wednesday, the House Agriculture Committee held their markup on the $1.9 trillion stimulus bill. Rep. Feenstra (IA-04) proposed several amendments, including one to provide relief for producers who were impacted by natural disasters in 2020. It would include damage from storms with high winds, like the derecho that impacted approximately 43 percent of cropland in Iowa last August. The House Agriculture Committee voted 24 to 23 to adopt Feenstra’s amendment, paving the way for Iowa ag producers to receive additional relief. Many producers were already grappling with market disruptions due to the COVID-19 pandemic when the derecho struck, so securing this disaster relief is a big win for Iowa farmers.” [Office Of Rep. Randy Feenstra, Press Release, 2/12/21]

**Miller-Meeks Thanked Trump For His Emergency Response To The 2020 Derecho.** “Thank you @realdonaldtrump and @iagovernor for your cooperation and leadership for the people of Iowa. This storm is one of the worst Iowa has ever seen. We are all working towards a speedy recovery. #ia02” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 8/17/20]

### Flood Recovery

2008: The Hawk Eye: **“Miller-Meeks Said Congress Needs To Modify Laws That Forbid Cities And Counties From Utilizing People Who Already Have Disaster Recovery Skills.”** “Even as most congressional candidates will spend the remainder of their campaigns focusing on the bailout bill, District 2 contenders are keeping flood recovery in the spotlight. […] Republican challenger Mariannette Miller-Meeks of Ottumwa blamed the lack of leadership of her Democratic opponent Rep. Dave Loebsack for part of the delay. Miller-Meeks said Congress needs to modify laws that forbid cities and counties from utilizing people who already have disaster recovery skills, as well as lowering the number of Small Business Administration loans that need to be at market rate.” [The Hawk Eye, 10/24/08]

2008: **Miller-Meeks Blamed The Media For Spending More Time On Hurricane Katrina Than It Had On The Iowa Flood, Which Made Members Of Congress Fail To See The Pressing Need In Iowa.** “Both Miller-Meeks and Grassley said part of the problem is Iowans took care of themselves, and the tragedy spent less time on the news than Hurricane Katrina, so people in Congress did not see the pressing need. Along with the two major
party candidates, Independent candidate Brian White of Iowa City and Green Party candidate Wendy Barth are vying for the 2nd District congressional seat.” [The Hawk Eye, 10/24/08]

**WHIP+**

Miller-Meeks Called WHIP+ “A Vital Resource For Farmers And Producers In Iowa.” “WHIP+ is a vital resource for farmers and producers in Iowa, and I was proud to cosponsor @RepThompson’s bipartisan bill to help farmers hit by disasters like the 2020 derecho. #IA02 #IowaAg” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 8/14/21]

- **WHIP+ (The Wildfire And Hurricane Indemnity Program Plus) Provided Payments To Producers Who Suffered Losses Due To Natural Disasters Occurring In 2018 And 2019.** “The Wildfire and Hurricane Indemnity Program Plus (WHIP+) provided payments to producers to offset losses from hurricanes, wildfires, and other qualifying natural disasters that occurred in 2018 and 2019. WHIP+ covered losses of crops, trees, bushes, and vines that occurred as a result of those disaster events, milk losses due to adverse weather conditions, and losses to on-farm stored commodities.” [U.S. Department of Agriculture, accessed 12/7/21]
Financial Protections & Wall Street

Significant Findings

✓ 2021: Miller-Meeks voted against the Consumer Protection and Recovery Act, which authorized the FTC to pursue legal action on consumer protection violations.

✓ 2021: Miller-Meeks voted against disapproving the Trump administration’s third-party lending rule, which left consumers vulnerable to predatory “rent-a-bank” schemes.

✓ 2021: Miller-Meeks voted against the Comprehensive Debt Collection Improvement Act.

✓ 2021: Miller-Meeks voted against new SEC disclosure standards on environmental, social, and governance metrics.

✓ Miller-Meeks received at least $380,412 in federal campaign contributions from finance, insurance, and real estate, including $48,500 from PACs alone.

✓ 2010: Miller-Meeks said she would not have voted for the economic bailout in October 2008.

Finance, Insurance, And Real Estate Sector Campaign Contributions

Career: Miller-Meeks Received $380,412 In Federal Campaign Contributions From Finance, Insurance, And Real Estate – Including $48,500 From PACs Alone

Career: Miller-Meeks Received $380,412 In Federal Campaign Contributions From Finance, Insurance & Real Estate Interests. As of January 2022, Miller-Meeks had disclosed $380,412 in contributions from the FIRE sector including $331,912 from individuals and $48,500 from PACS. [OpenSecrets.org, accessed 1/12/22]

• Career: Miller-Meeks Received $48,500 In Campaign Contributions From Finance, Insurance & Real Estate Industry PACs. [OpenSecrets.org, accessed 1/12/22]

2021-2022: Miller-Meeks Received $111,133 In Campaign Contributions From Finance, Insurance & Real Estate Interests. As of January 2022, Miller-Meeks had disclosed $111,133 in contributions from the FIRE sector including $85,633 from individuals and $25,500 from PACS. [OpenSecrets.org, accessed 1/12/22]

• 2021-2022: Miller-Meeks Received $25,500 In Campaign Contributions From Finance, Insurance & Real Estate Industry PACs. [OpenSecrets.org, accessed 1/12/22]

Federal Trade Commission

July 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Consumer Protection And Recovery Act, Which Authorized The FTC To Pursue Legal Action On Consumer Protection Violations

jurisdiction and redress for such violations. Specifically, it would authorize the agency to take legal action in federal court against a person, partnership or corporation that has violated consumer protection law in the preceding 10 years. It would allow the FTC to seek in such cases restitution for losses, contract rescission or reform, money refund or property return, and disgorgement, or legally mandated repayment, of unjust enrichment that a person, partnership or corporation obtained from such a violation.” The bill passed 221 to 205. [HR 2668, Vote #214, 7/20/21; CQ, 7/20/21]

Third-Party Lending

June 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Disapproving The Trump Administration’s Third-Party Lending Rule, Which Left Consumers Vulnerable To Predatory “Rent-A-Bank” Schemes

June 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Congressional Disapproval Of The Trump Administration’s Third-Party Lending Rule. In June 2021, Miller-Meeks Voted Against: “Passage of the joint resolution that would provide for congressional disapproval of an October 2020 Office of the Comptroller of the Currency rule stating that national banks are considered the ‘true lender’ of a loan if, at the date of the loan's origination, the bank funds the loan or is named as lender in the loan agreement, including in the case of loans issued in partnerships between banks and third parties, such as online financial firms. The rule went into effect on Dec. 29, 2020, and effectively allows nonbank lenders to offer loans not subject to higher state interest rate caps by originating loans in partnership with a national bank in another state. Under the provisions of the joint resolution, the October 2020 rule would have no force or effect.” The resolution passed, 218-208. [SJ Res 15, Vote #181, 6/24/21; CQ, 6/24/21]

• Opponents Of The Rule Argued That It Left Consumers Vulnerable To Predatory “Rent-A-Bank” Schemes. “But Democrats — along with a coalition of consumer protection and faith groups — have fiercely opposed the rule, claiming it leaves customers vulnerable to predatory ‘rent-a-bank’ schemes. ‘States are taking measures to protect their constituents their consumers against these end-runs around their laws designed to prohibit these predatory practices. But last October, in the middle of the pandemic, when many working families were plunged into economic uncertainty and turmoil, the Trump administration gave these rent-a-bank schemes a free pass to exploit these loopholes,’ said Sen. Chris Van Hollen (D-Md.), sponsor of the resolution to repeal the rule.” [The Hill, 5/11/21]

• “Rent-A-Bank” Schemes Were When “A Lender Temporarily Partners With A Bank To Evade Interest Rate Caps And Then Severs The Partnership After Taking Ownership Of The Loan.” “The OCC clamped down during the 2000s on rent-a-bank schemes, in which a lender temporarily partners with a bank to evade interest rate caps and then severs the partnership after taking ownership of the loan. Critics of the true lender rule say it will allow such schemes to flourish, particularly as nonbank online lenders make up a larger portion of the financial system.” [The Hill, 5/11/21]

Debt Collection

May 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Comprehensive Debt Collection Improvement Act

Miller-Meeks Voted Against Passage Of The Comprehensive Debt Collection Improvement Act. In May 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against: “Passage of the bill, as amended, that would make numerous modifications to existing law related to consumer protections against debt collection practices, including to extend protections related to electronic communications by debt collectors, student loan and medical debt, debt collection from servicemembers and debt collection by government contractors. The bill would prohibit debt collectors from contacting consumers by email, text message or social media without the consumer's consent. It would authorize the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to issue rules requiring debt collectors to allow consumers to opt out of any method of communication and prohibit the agency from issuing rules allowing debt collectors to send unlimited electronic communications to consumers. It would require lenders to discharge private education loans when a
student borrower dies or is permanently disabled, including for any cosigners of the loan. It would prohibit attempts to collect debt arising from medical services until two years after the date the first payment is due and prohibit the inclusion of debt arising from a medically necessary procedure on a credit report. It would prohibit debt collectors from using certain aggressive debt collection tactics against active-duty or recently discharged servicemembers, including threatening a servicemember with a reduction in rank, having their security clearance revoked or prosecuting them under the military justice system. It would extend existing prohibitions on unfair or excessive debt collection tactics to apply to debt collectors hired as contractors by federal, state or local governments; require federal agencies to wait at least 90 days after a debt becomes delinquent and notify consumers at least three times before transferring or selling such debt to a debt collector; and prohibit the Treasury Department from contracting debt collectors to recoup Federal Emergency Management Agency aid overpayments, unless they occurred because of fraud or deceit of the recipient. It would increase civil penalties and authorize courts to award injunctive relief for violations of debt collection practices law; specify that such law applies to entities engaging in non-judicial foreclosures; and restrict the use of written agreements in connection with commercial loans or other credits that include a confession of judgment or other waiver of rights in relation to a legal suit. Among other provisions, it would require numerous Government Accountability Office studies and reports to Congress, including on debt collection practices experienced by servicemembers and debt collection practices during the COVID-19 pandemic.

The bill would take effect 180 days after its enactment.” The bill passed 215 to 207. [H R 2547, Vote #141, 5/13/21; CQ, 5/13/21]

Disclosure Requirements

**June 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against New SEC Disclosure Standards On Environmental, Social, And Governance Metrics**

Miller-Meeks Voted Against A Bill That Established New Disclosure Standards For Publicly Traded Companies Related To Their Environmental, Social, And Governance Metrics. In June 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against: “Passage of the bill that would establish new disclosure requirements for publicly traded companies related to environmental, social, and governance (ESG) metrics; climate-related risks; political expenditures; executive pay; and tax information regarding overseas subsidiaries. It would direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to require publicly traded companies to disclose and define their ESG metrics as part of any filing that requires audited financial statements; require companies to disclose in any proxy or consent solicitation material for annual shareholder meetings a clear description of the link between ESG metrics and the company's long-term business strategy and processes used to determine the impact of such metrics on the business strategy; and require the SEC to establish a sustainable finance advisory committee to identify investment challenges and opportunities associated with sustainable finance and recommend policies to facilitate sustainable investments. It would require publicly traded companies to include in annual reports to the SEC information related to risks posed to the company by climate change, including a description of actions taken to identify and mitigate such risks and an evaluation of potential financial impacts of risk-management strategies” The bill passed by vote of 215 to 214. [H R 1187, Vote #169, 6/16/21; CQ, 6/16/21]

- **Miller-Meeks Voted For An Amendment Requiring The SEC To Study Disclosure Frameworks Related To Climate Or Environmental, Social, And Governance Metrics Before Requiring Public Companies To Make Such Disclosures.** In June 2021, Miller-Meeks voted for: “Hill, R-Ark., amendment no. 4 that would replace the text of the bill with a requirement that the Securities and Exchange Commission conduct a study of all disclosure frameworks related to the climate or environmental, social and governance metrics that any publicly traded company could use when making disclosures to investors voluntarily or by law. It would require the SEC to report to Congress on the study's findings and any inconsistencies between such disclosure frameworks, before it could require any new ESG or climate disclosures.” The amendment was rejected 204 to 225. [H R 1187, Vote #166, 6/16/21; CQ, 6/16/21]

2008 Financial Crisis
2010: Miller-Meeks Said She Would Not Have Voted For The Economic Bailout In October 2008

Miller-Meeks said she would not have voted for the $700 billion bailout in October 2008, and she doesn’t support the idea of a stimulus that creates only public employees. Instead, she would rather see a revised tax policy and fair and free trade agreements. [The Hawk Eye, 4/7/10]

2009: Miller-Meeks Said Iowa Has “Katrina-Like Economic Conditions” And All We Can See Is Bailout After Bailout After Bailout And Stimulus, Which Is Another Word For Bailout

In 2009, Miller-Meeks said Iowa has “Katrina-like economic conditions,” and “all we can see is bailout after bailout after bailout and stimulus, which is another word for bailout.” Miller-Meeks supports economic policies that support small business and institute tax reform that is simple, flat and fair. “Entrepreneurs and new businesses won’t take the risks necessary to create jobs when they are in a straight-jacket of regulation, taxes and fees,” Miller-Meeks said. [The Hawk Eye, 12/1/09]

Dodd-Frank

2010: Miller-Meeks Said Dodd-Frank “Perpetuates The Bailout Mentality” And Failed To Address Underlying Issues With Fannie Mae And Freddie Mac

Miller-Meeks: “Dodd-Frank Financial Reform Bill Perpetuates The Bailout Mentality And Fails To Address One Of The Main Culprits Of The 2008 Downturn - The Need To Reform Fannie Mae And Freddie Mac.” According to Miller-Meeks for Congress 2010 website under “Cut Spending, Cut Government Waste,” Miller-Meeks stated “Unfortunately, Wall Street and auto bailouts have rewarded failure and set a new expectation that taxpayers will always be a safety net for high-risk gambles. I oppose that philosophy, and recognize that Congress must enact important new regulatory reforms to prevent big banks and investment firms from having the ability to again bring our financial system to its knees. However, the Dodd-Frank financial reform bill perpetuates the bailout mentality and fails to address one of the main culprits of the 2008 downturn - the need to reform Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac which ultimately could cost taxpayers up to $1 trillion. I believe the TARP bailout money currently being repaid by the banks must go directly to paying down the hundreds of billions of dollars in debt taxpayers incurred to save them, and not used for new government spending or programs which will only worsen our debt standing. [Miller-Meeks for Congress 2010, accessed 6/15/20]
Foreign Policy Issues

**Significant Findings**

- Miller-Meeks called on Biden to resign after the withdrawal from Afghanistan, later claiming she only meant resign as commander-in-chief in charge of military decisions, not from the presidency.
  - August 27, 2021: Miller-Meeks called on Biden and several top advisors to resign after the withdrawal from Afghanistan.
  - September 18, 2021: Miller-Meeks walked back her call for Biden to resign and said she meant he “should cede his decision-making power over the military to someone else.”

- Miller-Meeks repeatedly criticized Biden for his handling of the withdrawal from Afghanistan, including in an op-ed co-written with Sen. Tom Cotton, and joined a resolution to censure Biden for the withdrawal.
  - The Miller-Meeks/Cotton op-ed claimed Biden timed the withdrawal for a “cheap political talking point and photo-op” coinciding with the 20th anniversary of the Sept. 11th attacks.

- Miller-Meeks warned in August 2021 of the danger of leaving Afghan evacuees behind, but in September she voted against $6.3 billion to aid Afghan evacuees.

- Miller-Meeks said the U.S. should have left 2,500 troops in Afghanistan to continue a counterterrorism mission.

- September 2021: Miller-Meeks voted against legislation ending military support for Saudi Arabia over Saudi involvement in the war in Yemen.
  - April 2021: Miller-Meeks voted for temporarily prohibiting arms sales to Saudi Arabia.

- July 2021: Miller-Meeks voted against funding the State Department’s international security, military, diplomatic, and peacekeeping programs.

- Miller-Meeks: “People feel that the United States has long been a military support for NATO, and that NATO countries have not been paid into NATO.”

- 2014: Miller-Meeks criticized President Obama for pulling US troops from Iraq too soon.
  - 2008: Miller-Meeks said the United States should not offer a withdrawal date from Iraq.

- 2008: Miller-Meeks said it was fair to debate whether the US should have invaded Iraq.

**Afghanistan**

August-September 2021: Miller-Meeks Called On Biden To Resign After The Withdrawal From Afghanistan, Later Claiming She Only Meant Resign As Commander-In-Chief

August 27, 2021: Miller-Meeks Called On Biden And Several Top Advisors To Resign After The Withdrawal
From Afghanistan. “Iowa Republican U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks called on President Joe Biden to resign late Thursday in the aftermath of a terrorist attack near Kabul, Afghanistan’s airport that killed at least 95 Afghans and 13 U.S. troops. ‘Joe Biden’s withdrawal of Afghanistan has been a failure and has ended with needless deaths and injuries,’ Miller-Meeks, a U.S. Army veteran and member of the House Homeland Security Committee, tweeted late Thursday. ‘Joe Biden should resign as Commander-In-Chief!’ Miller-Meeks added National Security Advisor Jake Sullivan, Defense Secretary Lloyd Austin and Secretary of State Anthony Blinken should also ‘hand in their resignations.’” [Quad-City Times, 8/27/21]

- August 26, 2021: Miller-Meeks Called On Twitter For Biden To Resign, Along With Officials Including Blinken And Mayorkas, “Given The Operational Failure Of The Withdrawal” From Afghanistan. “Given the operational failure of the withdrawal, President Biden should resign as commander-in-chief. Sullivan, Austin, Blinken, and Mayorkas should hand in their resignations. I’ve been calling for evacuations since June & now we have multiple needless casualties and injuries.” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 8/26/21]

September 18, 2021: Miller-Meeks Walked Back Her Call For Biden To Resign And Said She Meant He “Should Cede His Decision-Making Power Over The Military To Someone Else.” “Less than a month ago, Miller-Meeks, a combat veteran who retired from the U.S. Army as a lieutenant colonel, tweeted out that she also wanted Biden to resign as commander-in-chief. She clarified with the Press-Citizen on Saturday that she didn't mean Biden should step down as president, but instead should cede his decision-making power over the military to someone else. ‘(Resigning) is a challenging thing to do, but I think there needs to be an acknowledgement of what happened in Afghanistan, the withdrawal and what the plan was,’ she said.” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 9/18/21]

August-September 2021: Miller-Meeks Repeatedly Criticized Biden For His Handling Of The Withdrawal From Afghanistan And Called For His Censure

September 18, 2021: Miller-Meeks Said “Our Current President Has Been Wrong On Every Foreign Policy Decision For The Last Four Decades.” “Miller-Meeks said that the United States is ‘at a precipice,’ but chose to focus much of her 12 minutes in front of the crowd on issues and events far away from home. She and the other speakers vehemently criticized the Biden administration's choice to withdraw troops from Afghanistan and even called on most of the president's foreign policy team, like Secretary of State Antony Blinken and General Mark Milley, to resign. ‘Our current president has been wrong on every foreign policy decision for the last four decades. And he still hasn't learned good judgement,’ she said. ‘What happened in Afghanistan was incompetent and ineptitude, and let's hope it was only that.’” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 9/18/21]

September 18, 2021: Miller-Meeks Said “What Happened In Afghanistan Was Incompetent And Ineptitude, And Let's Hope It Was Only That.” “Miller-Meeks said that the United States is ‘at a precipice,’ but chose to focus much of her 12 minutes in front of the crowd on issues and events far away from home. She and the other speakers vehemently criticized the Biden administration's choice to withdraw troops from Afghanistan and even called on most of the president's foreign policy team, like Secretary of State Antony Blinken and General Mark Milley, to resign. ‘Our current president has been wrong on every foreign policy decision for the last four decades. And he still hasn't learned good judgement,’ she said. ‘What happened in Afghanistan was incompetent and ineptitude, and let's hope it was only that.’” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 9/18/21]

August 30, 2021: Miller-Meeks Said The Withdrawal From Afghanistan Was “A Defeat That Is Brought To Us By Our President.” “Republican Congresswoman Mariannette Miller-Meeks of Ottumwa says the withdrawal from Afghanistan is ‘an operational failure.’ ‘I served 24 years in the military, enlisted in 1974, and the next year saw the fall of Saigon,’ Miller-Meeks said this weekend. ‘My brother served in Vietnam and what I have watched over the past two weeks is a travesty.’ […] ‘This is a defeat that is brought to us by our president, not brought to us by our military or the Afghan military,’ Miller-Meeks said.” [Radio Iowa, 8/30/21]

August 28, 2021: Miller-Meeks Called Afghanistan “Biden’s Saigon.” “Miller-Meeks, who served 24 years in the Army, took it up a notch, calling Afghanistan ‘Biden's Saigon.’ She has called on Biden to resign. The Marines ‘did not deserve to be betrayed by their president,’ said Miller-Meeks, prompting calls of ‘traitor’ and ‘try him for
August 27, 2021: Miller-Meeks Joined A Resolution To Censure Biden Over The Afghanistan Withdrawal. “As Katie covered, several members have called on President Joe Biden to resign over his catastrophic failure in handling with the withdrawal from Afghanistan. Predictably, White House Press Secretary Jen Psaki scoffed at these calls with a confusing non-answer. […] Calls for resignation and impeachment aren't the only ways in which members are taking action against the president. Republican Reps. Lisa McClain of Michigan and Jeff Van Drew of New Jersey introduced a resolution on Friday to censure Biden. […] Other members included Reps. Jim Banks (R-IN), Bill Posey (R-FL), Carlos Gimenez (R-FL), Tom Rice (R-SC), Dan Crenshaw (R-TX), Mariannette Miller-Meeks (R-IA), David Rouzer (R-NC), Chris Smith (R-NJ), Eric Crawford (R-AR), Tracey Mann (R-KS) and Barry Moore (R-AL).” [Townhall, 8/27/21]

August 24, 2021: Miller-Meeks Said The Biden Administration Needed To “Take Full Responsibility For This Disaster” In Afghanistan And Said Biden “Continued To Point Fingers And Blame Others.” “U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, R-Iowa, during a speech on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives said that President Joe Biden needs to take full responsibility for the ‘disaster’ in Afghanistan. […] ‘The Biden Administration needs to take full responsibility for this disaster. They are making the decisions and need to be accountable for those decisions. President Biden said that the buck stops with him but he has continued to point fingers and blame others. ‘We need more answers regarding the decision-making process, and more answers on how the Biden Administration plans to extricate those left behind. It is our moral obligation to help them, and we must act now.'” [Iowa Torch, 8/24/21]


In An Op-Ed Co-Written With Tom Cotton, Miller-Meeks Claimed Biden “Refused To Take Firm Action To Save American Lives” In Afghanistan When Evacuating Kabul. “All of these actions led to the rapid implosion of the Afghan government and military after the expenditure of two decades of American blood, sweat, and treasure. Yet, even as Kabul fell to the Taliban, the president refused to take firm action to save American lives. When the Taliban, according to the Washington Post, offered the administration temporary control of Kabul to evacuate our citizens and allies, Biden told them that all we needed was access to the single-runway Afghan airport. He then trusted the Taliban with maintaining security outside of the airport. This had predictable consequences. American citizens were brutally beaten at Taliban checkpoints, U.S. officials said. Kabul devolved into chaos. Terrorists murdered 13 U.S. service members in the deadliest attack on Americans in Afghanistan in a decade. The Taliban, whom the president trusted, also started going house-to-house in search of U.S. and NATO allies. Journalists and women have been tortured, and the world watched in horror as terrified Afghans clung to the side of a C-17 and dropped to their death on the tarmac.” [Des Moines Register, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks and Sen. Tom Cotton Op-Ed, 9/27/21]

- **Cotton/Miller-Meeks Op-Ed: There Was “No Honor Or Dignity In What [Biden] Has Done” By Withdrawing From Afghanistan.** “The American people wanted Joe Biden to end the war in Afghanistan — not lose it. There is no honor or dignity in what he has done, and history will judge him harshly for it. It is time for him to apologize to the nation and remove those in his administration that led him down this destructive path.” [Des Moines Register, Tom Cotton And Mariannette Miller-Meeks Op-Ed, 9/27/21]

Miller-Meeks And Cotton Alleged That Biden Announced Withdrawal Of US Forces From Afghanistan By September 11th, 2021 “Soley For A Cheap Political Talking Point And Photo-Op.” “As president, Biden has tragically continued to stumble from one failure in Afghanistan to another. He started by announcing that all U.S. forces would leave Afghanistan in the middle of this year's fighting season and would be out of the country by Sept. 11, solely for a cheap political talking point and photo-op. He ordered the midnight evacuation of Bagram airbase, leaving our military without a multi-runway airport near Kabul and without essential air assets to support the Afghan military. He removed essential U.S. contractors who helped maintain the Afghan Air Force, which was central to the Afghan military's strategy that relied on air supremacy. As our military withdrew, the president failed
Miller-Meeks: The Biden Administration “Mishandled The Withdrawal [From Afghanistan] Since The Beginning” And “Should Not Have Advertised Our Withdrawal Strategy To The Entire World Just To Fit An Arbitrary And Symbolic Timeline.” “Miller-Meeks criticized the Biden Administration’s handling of the withdrawal from Afghanistan. ‘This Administration has mishandled the withdrawal since the beginning. For months, I worked with a bipartisan group of members pushing President Biden to begin immediately evacuating American soldiers and citizens, as well as our Afghan partners. We were stonewalled. This withdrawal has been an operational and possible intelligence failure at every step. It is important to separate our need to bring troops home or ‘end a war’ from how this withdrawal was executed. We should not have advertised our withdrawal strategy to the entire world just to fit an arbitrary and symbolic timeline,’ she said.” [Iowa Torch, 8/27/21]

Miller-Meeks And Cotton: “We Are Now More Vulnerable To A Terrorist Attack Planned In Afghanistan Than We Were On Sept. 11, 2001.” “The past month has been full of heartbreak, disappointment, and anger for thousands of veterans and Gold Star families. Through his actions, our commander-in-chief has disrespected 20 years of selfless American sacrifice in Afghanistan and has shown more interest in a photo-op than in honorably completing the mission our service members gave so much to accomplish. We are now more vulnerable to a terrorist attack planned in Afghanistan than we were on Sept. 11, 2001. Many in public life have been wrong about the war in Afghanistan, but few have been more consistently wrong than the president. Under the Obama administration, Joe Biden was wrong in opposing a counterinsurgency strategy to combat the Taliban, wrong about drawing down troops without a plan, and even wrong about killing Osama bin Laden. Joe Biden also stood by his boss when President Barack Obama, in exchange for an American traitor named Bowe Bergdahl, released five high-value Taliban commanders from Guantanamo Bay - four of whom now serve as senior officials in the Taliban ‘government’ in Kabul.” [Des Moines Register, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks and Sen. Tom Cotton Op-Ed, 9/27/21]

Miller-Meeks And Cotton: “The President's Much Vaunted ‘Airlift’ Stranded Hundreds Of American Citizens In A Terrorist-Run Country.” “The Biden administration's avalanche of incompetence has damaged our international reputation and humiliated the United States on the world stage. Yet, our president and secretary of state continue to pretend that the withdrawal from Afghanistan was a historic success. This breathtaking lie is an insult to the intelligence of every American and the sacrifice of every Afghan war veteran. Our troops have performed heroically, but the Biden administration has done nothing but fail in Afghanistan. The president's much vaunted ‘airlift’ stranded hundreds of American citizens in a terrorist-run country and left behind more than half of our Afghan allies who hold special immigrant visas. In many cases, this administration evacuated unvetted Afghans who are totally unconnected to our war effort in the country. Numerous individuals Biden was working to bring to this country have been flagged for their ties to terrorists and are being investigated.” [Des Moines Register, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks and Sen. Tom Cotton Op-Ed, 9/27/21]

Miller-Meeks/Cotton Op-Ed Alleged The Taliban Would Use American Military Equipment “To Spread Terror In Their Country And Around The World.” “On the 20th anniversary of 9/11, the Taliban, which still actively partner with al-Qaida, possess tens of billions of dollars of advanced U.S. military equipment and are stronger than ever before. There is absolutely no reason to believe that they won't use these weapons to spread terror in their country and around the world. The American people wanted Joe Biden to end the war in Afghanistan - not lose it. There is no honor or dignity in what he has done, and history will judge him harshly for it. It is time for him to apologize to the nation and remove those in his administration that led him down this destructive path.” [Des Moines Register, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks and Sen. Tom Cotton Op-Ed, 9/27/21]

Miller-Meeks: “13 US Service Members Gave Their Lives” Because Of “An Incompetent, Inept” Withdrawal From Afghanistan. MILLER-MEEKS: “Well, I think what really stood out is that what was apparent to us throughout this process in Afghanistan--and I’m a 24-year military veteran, served in the Army--was that, we know that this evacuation was conducted by the State Department, the Secretary of State, and yet we didn’t have the military experience, gave advice but didn’t stand their ground. And so, the entire withdrawal was a disaster. It was a debacle. There are Americans left behind. There are Afghan interpreters left behind. And unfortunately, 13 US service members gave their lives because they conducted an incompetent, inept operation of withdrawal.” [Fox News, 9/30/21] (VIDEO) 00:00:14

Miller-Meeks Accused Biden Of Abandoning Afghan Allies, Then Voted Against Funding To Aid Afghan Evacuees

Miller-Meeks Warned Of The Danger Of Leaving Afghan Allies Behind, And Voted To Expand SIVs For Afghan Partners…

Miller-Meeks Said Leaving Allies Behind In Afghanistan Would Impact America’s Ability To Collect Intelligence And Conduct Counterterrorism Activities In The Future. “Miller-Meeks said leaving allies behind will impact America’s ability to collect intelligence and conduct counter-terrorism activities in the future. ‘We have a responsibility to these individuals to help protect them and extricate them out of the country,’ she said. ‘We know how the Taliban operates. We know how al-Qaeda operates. We know they’ll be executed.’” [Radio Iowa, 8/17/21]

Miller-Meeks Said Leaving Allies Behind In Afghanistan Would Result In Those Individuals’ Execution. “Miller-Meeks said leaving allies behind will impact America’s ability to collect intelligence and conduct counter-terrorism activities in the future. ‘We have a responsibility to these individuals to help protect them and extricate them out of the country,’ she said. ‘We know how the Taliban operates. We know how al-Qaeda operates. We know they’ll be executed.’” [Radio Iowa, 8/17/21]

Miller-Meeks Voted For Authorizing An Additional 8,000 Special Immigrant Visas For Afghan Interpreters, Contractors, And Others Employed By The US Government Who Faced Dangers As A Consequence Of Such Employment. In February 2015, Miller-Meeks voted for: “Passage of the bill that would authorize an additional 8,000 special immigrant visas for Afghan interpreters, contractors, and others employed by the U.S. government who face ongoing serious threats as a consequence of such employment. It would also modify the program to remove a requirement that applicants provide a "credible sworn statement" regarding dangerous country conditions as evidence of an ongoing serious threat, instead requiring them to have "asserted a credible basis for concern about the possibility of an ongoing serious threat" as a result of their employment; remove a requirement that applicants must have performed "sensitive and trusted" activities for the U.S. military personnel; and clarify that Afghan nationals who worked under U.S.-funded cooperative agreements or grants are eligible for the program.” The bill passed 407 to 16. [HR 3985, Vote #218, 7/22/21; CQ, 7/22/21]

Miller-Meeks Claimed Biden “Chose To Leave Behind Americans And Allies And Reportedly Advised Other Nations Not To Accept Them If They Somehow Got Out” Of Afghanistan. “The President of the most powerful nation and his hand picked Sec of State chose to leave behind Americans and allies and reportedly advised other nations not to accept them if they somehow got out.” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 8/31/21]

Miller-Meeks Said She Supported Bringing Afghan Refugees To The United States Because “They Support The Ideals Of America And Our Value System And They Would Be Assets In Our Countries.” “Now, Representative Mariannette Miller-Meeks is weighing in on the potential to house Afghan refugees in the United States -- something she is very much for. ‘I’d be willing to suggest to people in Iowa that these are individuals that have helped us they have been there for us they support the ideals of America and our value system and they would
be assets in our countries,’ she shared during an interview with KYOU. She urges Iowans to gain a better understanding and to ‘open their hearts’ to those who had helped us in a past war.” [KCRG, 8/18/21]

August 2021: Miller-Meeks Sponsored A Bill Prohibiting Federal Funding To The Afghan Government Until Biden Certified That All U.S. Citizens And Partners Had Been Evacuated. On August 27, 2021, Miller-Meeks sponsored HR 5117, the Ensuring Evacuation from Afghanistan Act of 2021, which “prohibits providing federal funding to the government of Afghanistan until the President certifies to Congress that all U.S. citizens, U.S. lawful permanent residents, coalition partners, and Afghan allies who would like to evacuate from Afghanistan have been evacuated. The bill also requires asset-blocking sanctions on the Afghan government until the President makes the certification.” The bill was read twice and referred to House Foreign Affairs. [HR 5117, Sponsored, 8/27/21; CQ, 8/27/21]

…But One Month Later, Miller-Meeks Voted Against Funding To Support Afghan Evacuees

September 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Extending Government Funding Through December 3, 2021; Bill Included Funding For Afghan Evacuee Assistance. On September 30, 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against the “DeLauro, D-Conn., motion to concur in the Senate amendment to the bill that would provide funding for federal government operations and services through Dec. 3, 2021, at fiscal 2021 levels and provide emergency funding for natural disaster relief and Afghan evacuee assistance.” The motion was agreed to by a vote of 254-175. [CQ, 9/30/21; HR 5305, Vote 311, 9/30/21]

September 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against A Bill Providing $6.3 Billion To Support Afghan Evacuees. On September 21, 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against the “Passage of the bill that would provide funding for federal government operations and services through Dec. 3, 2021, at fiscal 2021 levels; provide emergency funding for natural disaster relief and Afghan evacuee assistance; and suspend the statutory limit on federal debt through Dec. 16, 2022. […] It would provide $6.3 billion in supplemental appropriations to support Afghan evacuees, including $2.2 billion for Defense Department assistance to Afghans under the special immigrant visa program and on U.S. military installations; $1.7 billion for Health and Human Services Department resettlement and support services for Afghan arrivals and refugees; and $1.8 billion for the State Department, including $277 million for evacuation and related services, $1.1 billion for resettlement and support services for Afghans in the United States, and $415 million for migration and refugee assistance.” [CQ, 9/21/21; H.R. 5305, Vote 267, 9/21/21]

- Short-Term Government Funding Extension Included $6.3 Billion For Afghan Refugees. “It would provide $6.3 billion in supplemental appropriations to support Afghan evacuees, including $2.2 billion for Defense Department assistance to Afghans under the special immigrant visa program and on U.S. military installations; $1.7 billion for Health and Human Services Department resettlement and support services for Afghan arrivals and refugees; and $1.8 billion for the State Department, including $277 million for evacuation and related services, $1.1 billion for resettlement and support services for Afghans in the United States, and $415 million for migration and refugee assistance. The bill would also provide additional appropriations or higher spending rates for certain programs, including $2.5 billion for Health and Human Services Department refugee assistance to support services for unaccompanied minors who have crossed the U.S. border; $250 million for U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services for application processing and refugee program support; increased amounts for cash-value vouchers under the supplemental nutrition program for women, infants and children (WIC); and increased spending for White House COVID-19 activities and the national suicide hotline.” [CQ, 9/30/21]

Miller-Meeks Said The US Should Have Maintained Its Presence Of 2,500 Troops In Afghanistan To Continue A Counterterrorism Mission

Miller-Meeks Said America’s Long-Term Strategy Should Have Been Leaving 2,500 Troops In Afghanistan To Continue A Counterterrorism Mission. “Miller-Meeks said the U.S. went into Afghanistan to ensure the country wasn’t a safe harbor for terrorists and she said the long-term strategy should have been to leave 2500 U.S.
troops in the country to continue a counter-terrorism mission.” [Radio Iowa, 8/17/21]

Miller-Meeks Argued Afghanistan Had Been Relatively Stable With 2,500 Troops Before The Withdrawal.
“Miller-Meeks argued Afghanistan was relatively stable with 2,500 troops and the Taliban pushed to periphery in the rural areas. ‘We had the ability to do airstrikes’ and provide air cover from Bagram air base, ‘and we were preventing other terrorist organizations from once again getting a foothold in Afghanistan to use it as a terrorist base,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘We absolutely have a counter-terrorist mission in Afghanistan. The president could have explained that to people. ... We're now in a position where (the Taliban) have Humvees, military weapons, infrared goggles, Black Hawk helicopters. ‘We have equipment that was left there that now they have in their hands so it's going to be much more difficult now to secure the safety and extraction of Americans and our military and Afghan partners than it would have been had this operation been planned and conducted appropriately.’” [Quad-City Times, 8/27/21]

September 19, 2021: Miller-Meeks Said That Were She In Afghanistan When Orders Were Received To Evacuate, She Would Have Resigned

Miller-Meeks: “I Know If I Had Been Given An Order To Leave Bagram Air Force Base And Put My Soldiers At Risk, I Would Have Resigned Rather Than Put Their Lives At Risk.” “Miller-Meeks, an eye doctor who is an Army veteran, spent much of her 12-minute speech talking about the U.S. withdrawal from Afghanistan. ‘I know if I had been given an order to leave Bagram Air Force Base and put my soldiers at risk, I would have resigned rather than put their lives at risk,’ Miller-Meeks said, to cheers.” [Radio Iowa, 9/19/21]

September 14, 2021: Miller-Meeks Said The Taliban Was Not A Legitimate Government And “Should Never Be Recognized As Such”

Miller-Meeks: “The Taliban Is Not A Legitimate Government And Should NEVER Be Recognized As Such.” “The Taliban is not a legitimate government and should NEVER be recognized as such. #IA02” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 9/14/21]

 Miller-Meeks: The Taliban Was “Not The Legitimate Government Of Afghanistan, And Should Not Be Recognized As Such.” “The Taliban is not the legitimate government of Afghanistan, and should not be recognized as such. #IA02” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 9/8/21]

August 27, 2021: Miller-Meeks Said Biden Could Have Withdrawn From Trump’s Deal With The Taliban But Chose To Stay In And Delay The Withdrawal From Afghanistan

Miller-Meeks Said Biden Could Have Withdrawn From Trump’s Deal With The Taliban But Chose To Stay In And Delay The Withdrawal From Afghanistan. “Biden has said that there was no way US could have withdrawn from Afghanistan ‘without chaos ensuing,’ and that he was handcuffed by a poorly drawn peace deal made by former President Donald Trump’s administration with the Taliban that excluded the Afghan government. Biden has said the deal bound him to withdraw U.S. troops and the set stage for the chaos engulfing the country, arguing the terms failed to protect Afghanistan once the U.S. military pulled out. […] Miller-Meeks said the Biden administration could have withdrawn from the accord, but instead chose to stay in, while delaying the complete pullout from May to the end of August. She noted Biden's reversal of other foreign policy decisions by the Trump administration, including reinserting the United States into the Paris Climate Accord and Iran nuclear deal. Biden, though, likely would have had little leverage to renegotiate the peace deal, and has adamantly said he would not commit to sending more American troops to fight the Taliban in the middle of the spring fighting season.” [Quad-City Times, 8/27/21]

• When Asked If She Supported The Trump Administration’s Negotiations With The Taliban, Miller-Meeks Said She “Wasn’t In Office At The Time” But That Trump “Had Certain Conditions” That Were
“Breached.” HOST: “Congressman, last year the Trump administration was negotiating with the Taliban. Then, former Secretary of State Mike Pompeo took a photo op with Abdul Ghani Baradar, and then of course the former president also had invited the Taliban to the U.S., Camp David, last year, which we know didn't end up happening, but there was an invite. Did you support that level of engagement with the Taliban last year?” MILLER-MEEKS: “I wasn’t in office at the time that this was negotiated, but if you’ll remember that President Trump had certain conditions in order to be able to interact with the Taliban. And those conditions were breached. So, there was no need to go forward with the withdrawal when the conditions that were on the ground set to have interactions with the Taliban were breached.” [Bloomberg, 8/31/21] (VIDEO) 00:01:26

August 18, 2021: Miller-Meeks Claimed The Taliban “Feared And Respected President Trump” And That Withdrawal Would Have Gone Differently Under His Presidency

Miller-Meeks: The Withdrawal From Afghanistan “Would’ve Been Absolutely Different” Under Trump Because The Taliban “Feared And Respected President Trump.” LEONARD: “President Trump wanted us out May 1st. Do you know if President Trump had any better plans for dealing with a situation like this or would we have been in the same position or worse on May 1st, which was President Trump’s deadline?” MILLER-MEEKS: “I think it would’ve been absolutely different. Number one, President Trump is a different president. President Trump did not put us back in to the Iran nuclear agreement, which President Biden did, which further emboldened Iran and terrorists and jihadists in the Middle East. President Trump took out Soleimani. So, the terrorists, the jihadists, the Taliban, knew that President Trump would act, and they feared and respected President Trump. And so, to compare the two, President Trump would have had a plan, and he had conditions, and conditions for withdrawal, and he would have made sure those conditions were met before he would withdraw troops. So, I think to say that because President Trump initiated an agreement to remove troops by May doesn’t mean the outcome would have been the same.” [KNIA-KRLS, 8/18/21] (AUDIO) 00:07:52

Miller-Meeks Said Trump Would Not Have Abandoned The Afghans Like He Abandoned The Kurds Because He “Learned From Previous Actions.” LEONARD: “And you expressed regrets he abandoned the Kurds. Do you know that he wouldn’t have abandoned the Afghanistan people?” MILLER-MEEKS: “I think because President Trump learned from previous actions, and I think the actions that he took on Soleimani, I think, demonstrated that he had learned more about the Middle East, how to interact with the Middle East, what things they respect, and how to conduct operations.” [KNIA-KRLS, 8/18/21] (AUDIO) 00:10:12

2010: The Hawk Eye Wrote “Miller-Meeks Said It May Be Necessary To Revise The Timeline For Withdrawal” From Iraq And Afghanistan To Achieve Missions Of Stopping Violence And Terror

The Hawk Eye: “Miller-Meeks Said It May Be Necessary To Revise The Timeline For Withdrawal To Accomplish The Missions Abroad To Halt Violence And Stem Terrorism” On Withdrawing Troops From Iraq And Afghanistan. “On the United States’ efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan, Miller-Meeks said it may be necessary to revise the timeline for withdrawal to accomplish the missions abroad to halt violence and stem terrorism and ‘win the hearts and minds’ of citizens. Ultimately, though, Miller-Meeks said she would defer to the troops and generals on the ground in those countries. ‘I think (Defense) Secretary (Robert) Gates has been very engaged. When he testifies before Congress that he is always very thoughtful,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘I always have the sense that he is a person of high integrity, and he’s a very honest individual.’” [The Hawk Eye, 4/7/10]

Israel

September 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted For Funding Israel’s Iron Dome, Which She Said “Must Be A Top Priority Of This Congress”

Miller-Meeks Voted For Providing $1 Billion In Funding For Israel’s Iron Dome. In September 2021, Miller-Meeks voted for: “DeLauro, D-Conn., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill that would provide $1 billion in
emergency funding for the Defense Department to provide assistance to the government of Israel for the procurement of the Iron Dome defense system to counter short-range rocket threats. The funding would remain available through Sept. 30, 2024.” The motion was agreed to by a vote of 420-9. [HR 5323, Vote #275, 9/23/21; CQ, 9/24/21]

Miller-Meeks: “Fully Funding The Iron Dome Missile Defense System Must Be A Top Priority Of This Congress.” “Our relationship with Israel is mutually beneficial, and it is important that we work to support them whenever we can. That means fully funding the Iron Dome missile defense system must be a top priority of this Congress. #IronDomeSavesLives #IA02 #StandWithIsrael” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 9/23/21]

Saudi Arabia

September 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Legislation Ending Military Support For Saudi Arabia Over Saudi Involvement In The War In Yemen

On September 23, 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against the “Khanna, D-Calif., amendment no. 28 that would terminate U.S. military logistical support and transfer of spare parts to Saudi warplanes conducting aerial strikes against the Houthis in Yemen. It would also permanently end intelligence sharing that enables offensive strikes and any U.S. effort to command, coordinate, participate in the movement of, or accompany Saudi-led coalition forces in the war in Yemen.” The amendment was adopted by a vote of 219 to 207. [CQ, 9/23/21; H.R. 4350, Vote 278, 9/23/21]

September 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against An Amendment To Suspend Support For Saudi Air Force Units Responsible For Airstrikes Resulting In Civilian Casualties In Yemen. On September 23, 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against the “Meeks, D-N.Y., amendment no. 30 that would suspend U.S. maintenance support for Saudi air force units determined to be responsible for airstrikes resulting in civilian casualties in Yemen.” The amendment was adopted by a vote of 223 to 204. [CQ, 9/23/21; H.R. 4350, Vote 279, 9/23/21]

April 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted For Temporarily Prohibiting Arms Sales To Saudi Arabia

Miller-Meeks Voted For Prohibiting For 120 Days, Any Arms Sale Or Transfer From The U.S. To The Government Of Saudi Arabia. In April 2021, Miller-Meeks voted for: “Meeks, D-N.Y., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended, that would prohibit, for 120 days, the sale, licensing or transfer of any defense article or services from the U.S. to an intelligence, security or law enforcement agency of the government of Saudi Arabia. It would permit such activities to resume if the president certifies to Congress that Saudi Arabia, in the previous 120 days, has not forced the repatriation, intimidation or murder of dissidents in other countries; unjustly imprisoned U.S. citizens or permanent residents in Saudi Arabia; or tortured detainees in its custody. It would provide exceptions to the prohibition related to the defense of Saudi Arabia from external threats and the defense of U.S. personnel and facilities in Saudi Arabia. The bill would also require multiple reports to Congress related to intimidation or harassment of Saudi nationals in the United States, including on whether Saudi diplomatic officials in the U.S. used diplomatic credentials or facilities to facilitate harm to or monitoring, surveillance, or harassment of other Saudi nationals in the country; whether any Saudi official engaged in a consistent pattern of intimidation or harassment against journalist Jamal Khashoggi or other individuals in the U.S.; and whether and how the U.S. intelligence community fulfilled its duty to warn Khashoggi of threats against him.” The motion was agreed to 350-71. [HR 1392, Vote #130, 4/21/21; CQ, 4/21/21]

Cybersecurity
August 2021: Miller-Meeks Criticized Biden For Giving Putin A List Of Infrastructure Entities Off-Limits To Cyber Attacks

Miller-Meeks Said Biden Giving Putin A List Of Infrastructure Entities That Were Off-Limits To Cyber Attacks Was “Not The Way To Ensure Our Cybersecurity And That Hacking Attacks Such As That Decrease.” “Miller-Meeks agreed with the threat that growing cyberattacks pose on the United States as well as globally, but disagreed with Biden’s method of responding to them. ‘I think that there are other people that have also come to that conclusion that it could lead to that. But that also means that it’s this much more important that we take our cybersecurity very seriously, and that we enact penalties and sanctions upon those that hack, those that request ransomware and gain money. So it is a very serious issue,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘I think giving a list to Vladimir Putin saying these are the companies in the U.S. you don’t attack is not the way to ensure our cybersecurity and that hacking attacks such as that decrease. We need to have a very bold, very strong approach, so that we can avoid any shooting war.’

This was in reference to a declaration President Biden made on June 16 where he told reporters that he gave Putin a list of 16 infrastructure entities that are ‘off-limits’ to an attack. Many people criticized this approach fearing it could entice attacks on the remaining entities.” [Fox News, 8/2/21]

June 2021: Miller-Meeks Joined A Letter Urging Biden To Act On Cyberattacks, Which Called For “Tangible Action” Against “Chronic Offenders Such As Russia And China”

June 2021: Miller-Meeks joined a letter urging President Biden to act on cyberattacks, which called for “tangible action” against “chronic offenders such as Russia and China.” “Most importantly, we call upon you and your administration to address cyberattacks on American critical infrastructure as the acts of adversarial aggression they embody. Reconsidering diplomatic relationships with nation-states that enable or harbor cyber criminals, shield their actions or identities, or protect the custody of these individuals is a needed escalation to address growing numbers of crippling cyberattacks. These nations and their leaders should be held accountable, and the resolution of these attacks should be leveraged in diplomatic, trade, and other negotiations. For chronic offenders such as China and Russia – whose governments have both been directly connected to cybercrime originating within their borders – we urge a strong, punitive stance in relations, and tangible action seeking accountability.” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 6/29/21]

- The Letter Called The Cyberattacks “Acts Of Adversarial Aggression” And Called For “Tangible Action” Against “Chronic Offenders Such As Russia And China.”

State Department

July 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Funding The State Department’s International Security, Military, Diplomatic, And Peacekeeping Programs

July 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Funding The State Department’s International Security, Military, Diplomatic, And Peacekeeping Programs. In July 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against: “Passage of the bill, as amended, that would provide $62.2 billion in discretionary funding for the State Department and related agencies. Among other provisions, it would provide over $9 billion for international security assistance, including $3.3
billion in military assistance for Israel. It would provide $1.9 billion for international peacekeeping activities; over $1.6 billion for implementation of U.S. diplomatic and defense strategy in the Indo-Pacific region, including activities to counter Chinese influence in developing countries; and $1.8 billion for the U.S. Agency for International Development. It would provide $4.6 billion for global health programs, including $760 million for family planning and reproductive health programs. It would provide over $3 billion to address climate change and other environmental issues, including $1.6 billion for a multilateral Green Climate Fund to help developing countries address climate change, $269 million for renewable energy programs, and $125 million to combat wildlife trafficking.” The bill passed 217-212. [H R 4373, Vote #243, 7/28/21; CQ, 7/28/21]

NATO

Miller-Meeks: “People Feel That The United States Has Long Been A Military Support For NATO, And That NATO Countries Have Not Been Paid Into NATO”

According to an interview given on Caffeinated Thoughts Podcast, when asked for Q: Trump on NATO? “it is not a new concept that people feel that the United States has long been a military support for NATO, and that NATO countries have not been paid into NATO, to the degree that they should. […] So I think from that standpoint, being vocal about it and being upfront about it, I think that type of candid speech is not something that’s common. And so I think the President voiced what a lot of people in the United States feel about NATO, and that they too need to be responsible for their own defense and for upholding the values of NATO and the outcome of, you know, two civil wars that led to the development of NATO. Okay. Not to civil wars, two world wars.” [Caffeinated Thoughts, 00:13:20, 12/3/19] (AUDIO)

Iraq

2014: Miller-Meeks Criticized President Obama For Pulling US Troops From Iraq Too Soon

“Miller-Meeks, however, has not made a persuasive case for why voters should remove the incumbent. […] She is not shy about expressing contempt for the Affordable Care Act, though she acknowledges it is law. And she is unflinching in criticizing President Obama for pulling U.S. troops from Iraq too soon and for a lack of clarity in dealing with terrorist threats.” [Des Moines Register, Editorial Board, 10/22/14]

2010: The Hawk Eye Wrote “Miller-Meeks Said It May Be Necessary To Revise The Timeline For Withdrawal From Iraq And Afghanistan To Achieve Missions Of Stopping Violence And Terror

“The Iraq war is a concern too. She said the troop surge of last year has helped reduce the...
number of attacks. She sees keeping a small amount of troops in the country as a drawdown begins, similar to troops we have in many countries around the globe. She said she doesn’t know how many years a drawdown will take.” [Daily Democrat, 5/1/08]

### 2008: Miller-Meeks Said It Was Fair To Debate Whether The US Should Have Invaded Iraq

**The Hawk Eye:** Miller-Meeks said it’s fair to debate whether the United States should have invaded Iraq but since Congress voted in favor of the effort, it is now an obligation to give soldiers support. ‘That means the number of troops, the armor, the equipment and the support of all of us back home, and that means supporting their families and making sure that when they come back they have the proper counseling,’ Miller-Meeks said. She said the United States should not offer a withdrawal date because it’s illogical to keeping stability nor should it expect to have the exact same style of democracy as is here.” [The Hawk Eye, 5/27/08]

### 2008: Miller-Meeks Said The United States Should Not Offer A Withdrawal Date From Iraq

**The Hawk Eye:** Miller-Meeks said it’s fair to debate whether the United States should have invaded Iraq but since Congress voted in favor of the effort, it is now an obligation to give soldiers support. ‘That means the number of troops, the armor, the equipment and the support of all of us back home, and that means supporting their families and making sure that when they come back they have the proper counseling,’ Miller-Meeks said. She said the United States should not offer a withdrawal date because it’s illogical to keeping stability nor should it expect to have the exact same style of democracy as is here.” [The Hawk Eye, 5/27/08]

### Iran


January 2020: Miller-Meeks said she supported the US military strike that killed Iranian Gen. Qassem Soleimani. “Early reactions to the U.S. military strike that killed Iranian Gen. Qassem Soleimani fell along party lines in Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District. […] ‘Qassem Soleimani has the blood of hundreds of Americans on his hands and thanks to (the) leadership of our Commander in Chief and our brave military service member, justice has been served,’ State Sen. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, R-Ottumwa, said in a statement.” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 1/3/20]

### 2015: Miller-Meeks Tweeted That The Iran Nuclear Deal “Could Well Be” The Worst Political Blunder Of All Time

2015: Miller-Meeks tweeted that the Iran nuclear deal “could well be” the worst political blunder of all time. “Could well be: RT @NRO : Is the Iran Deal the Worst Political Blunder of All Time? http://bit.ly/1Vrkvm2” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 7/21/15]

### 2015: Miller-Meeks Tweeted A Joke About Obama Avoiding Responsibility For The Iran Nuclear Deal

“Obama on Iranian Nuclear Non-Deal: Uber Success! We lift econ sanctions, Iran makes bomb, I'll be long gone as POTUS, so it's Bush's fault” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 4/3/15]

### Libya
### 2014: Miller-Meeks Raised Questions About The Benghazi Attack And Said The United States Government Owed Americans Accountability

2014: Miller-Meeks Raised Questions About The Benghazi Attack And Said The United States Government Owed Americans Accountability. “Miller-Meeks, an ophthalmologist who retired from the Army Reserves as a lieutenant colonel, said, ‘It’s disgusting what happened with the VA. This is something that should never have happened.’ She also raised questions about the deadly attack in Benghazi, Libya, on Sept. 11, 2012, in which U.S. Ambassador J. Christopher Stevens and Sean Smith, a U.S. Foreign Service information management officer, were killed, and also mentioned the weekend trade of Taliban prisoners that freed U.S. Army Sgt. Bowe Bergdahl after he had been held captive for five years. ‘We need a government that is accountable to the people,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘If the administration in Washington can’t fix the problems, then the voters need to send two lieutenant colonels there who can do it for them.’” [The Quad-City Times, 6/5/14]

### Miller-Meeks: “The Fact That Our Nation, The Most Powerful Nation On Earth, Would Leave People On A Rooftop In Benghazi And Not Go To Their Aid Is A Travesty”


“Miller-Meeks said she was amazed by the “Main Stream Press” and how for at least the past five years they have failed to call the Obama administration to task for a long list of alleged transgressions. She pointed to […] Benghazi, where Americans died. ‘And as a veteran, let me tell you, the fact that our nation, the most powerful nation on Earth, would leave people on a rooftop in Benghazi and not go to their aid is a travesty,’ Miller-Meeks said, which was immediately followed by claps of appreciation by the audience. ‘That is a travesty.’” [Ad Express & Daily Iowegian, 4/18/14]

### ISIS

**October 2014: Miller-Meeks Supported Coalition Engagement, Air Strikes And Re-Establishing A Small Contingent Of Ground Troops To Fight ISIS**

Miller-Meeks Supported Coalition Engagement, Air Strikes And Re-Establishing A Small Contingent Of Ground Troops To Fight ISIS. “Mariannette Miller-Meeks (R) ‘We are facing a serious threat from ISIS because politics trumped good policy when we left Iraq without securing a Status of Forces Agreement. This leadership vacuum was filled by aggressive actors like ISIS. I support coalition engagement and ongoing air strikes but a small contingent of ground troops may be necessary to re-establish our intelligence apparatus and provide security, humanitarian assistance while local forces are trained. Although unpopular, the alternative of allowing ISIS to strengthen and take over larger parts of the Middle East is more dangerous and destabilizing.’” [Des Moines Register, 10/29/14]

**October 2014, The Quad-City Times: “Miller-Meeks Faulted Loebsack, As A Member Of Congress, For Not Seeing The Potential For The Sunni Militant Group, Isis, To Spread Throughout Iraq And Syria”**

The Quad-City Times: “Miller-Meeks Faulted Loebsack, As A Member Of Congress, For Not Seeing The Potential For The Sunni Militant Group, ISIS, To Spread Throughout Iraq And Syria.” “The two also have foreign policy differences. At a recent debate on Iowa Public Television, Miller-Meeks faulted Loebsack, as a member of Congress, for not seeing the potential for the Sunni militant group, ISIS, to spread throughout Iraq and Syria. She, like other Republicans, said American forces should have been left in Iraq to combat the group, pointing to past wars, such as World War II and Korea, after which U.S. troops were left in foreign lands until their governments stabilized.” [The Quad-City Times, 10/13/14]
December 2015: Miller-Meeks Said Hillary Clinton Failed To Present A Coherent Strategy Against ISIS As A Secretary Of State And Presidential Candidate

Miller-Meeks Said Hillary Clinton Failed To Present A Coherent Strategy Against ISIS As A Secretary Of State And Presidential Candidate. “The civil war in Syria has raged for nearly five years, leading to more than 220,000 deaths and 4 million refugees. It is one of the great humanitarian disasters of our time, and it has given a strategic beachhead to singularly demonic cult determined to spread terror, fear and death: ISIS. Ridding the world of this uniquely dangerous group demands a coherent strategy. Hillary Clinton failed in this regard as secretary of state and fails to present one now as a presidential candidate.” [Des Moines Register, Miller-Meeks op-ed, 12/10/15]

Miller-Meeks: “President Obama And Clinton Are, In Many Ways, The Unwitting Architects Of ISIS.” “President Obama and Clinton are, in many ways, the unwitting architects of ISIS, as it was their anemic foreign policy that allowed the group to flourish unchecked for years. Clinton and Obama had many opportunities to end the mayhem in Syria. Instead, Obama/Clinton dithered away months while the country descended further into chaos. Moderate Muslims, who desired a lasting peace, were decimated as the Syrian regime engaged in wholesale slaughter of civilians. Into the power vacuum rushed militant Islamists with a penchant for theatrically brutal violence.” [Des Moines Register, Miller-Meeks op-ed, 12/10/15]

Miller-Meeks: “Clinton’s Record On ISIS Is Riddled With Failures, Borne From Her Inability To Understand How The Obama Administration’s Weakness Emboldened Adversaries In Syria And Across The Globe.” “Clinton’s record on ISIS is riddled with failures, borne from her inability to understand how the Obama administration’s weakness emboldened adversaries in Syria and across the globe. Mrs. Clinton has a long and well-know record on foreign policy issues. Unfortunately for her, it demonstrates that once again Iowans can’t trust her to keep Americans safe at home or abroad. Dr. Mariannette Miller-Meeks of Ottumwa, an ophthalmologist and 24-year veteran of the U.S. Army, serves on the Iowa GOP’s State Central Committee. She is a former director of the Iowa Department of Public Health and candidate for Congress.” [Des Moines Register, Miller-Meeks op-ed, 12/10/15]

August 2014: Miller-Meeks Said It Should Have Been Evident That A Terrorist Group Called The Islamic State Was A Growing Threat

Miller-Meeks Said It Should Have Been Evident That A Terrorist Group Called The Islamic State Was A Growing Threat. “Miller-Meeks, who lost to Loebsack in 2008 and 2010, said the administration lacks a coherent foreign policy strategy and it has created mounting problems in Iraq, Ukraine and the entire Middle East. […] Miller-Meeks said it should have been evident that the terrorist group that calls itself the Islamic State was a growing threat and she questioned an Obama administration decision not to negotiate an agreement that would have provided for ‘residual troops’ to maintain stability during the transition to an emerging government in Iraq.” [The Gazette, 8/29/14]

Islamophobia

December 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Establishing A State Department Office To Monitor And Combat Islamophobia In Foreign Countries

December 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Establishing A State Department Office To Monitor And Combat Islamophobia In Foreign Countries. On December 14, 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against the “Passage of the bill, as amended, that would create an Office to Monitor and Combat Islamophobia within the State Department, headed by a presidentially-appointed special envoy, to monitor and combat ‘acts of Islamophobia and Islamophobic incitement’ in foreign countries and coordinate related reporting activities. It would expand requirements for annual department reports related to human rights and religious freedom to include information
regarding Islamophobia, including to describe the nature and extent of instances of physical violence and harassment against Muslims; instances of propaganda promoting or justifying ‘racial hatred’ or violence against Muslims; government actions to protect religious freedoms and promote tolerance of Muslims; and instances of forced labor, reeducation or concentration camps such as those targeting Uyghurs in the Xinjiang Autonomous Region of China. It would also prohibit funds made available pursuant to the bill from being used to promote or endorse the ideology of the Boycott, Divestment, Sanctions movement against Israel or to promote or endorse a ‘Muslim ban,’ such as former President Trump’s order restricting travel from certain Muslim-majority countries.” The bill passed by a vote of 219-212. [H.R. 5665, Vote 448, 12/14/21; CQ, 12/14/21]

- Iowa Capital Dispatch: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Creating A State Department Office To Counter Islamophobia Worldwide. “The U.S. House following a vitriolic debate passed a bill along party lines Tuesday night to create a State Department office that would counter Islamophobia worldwide. Democrats said a conflict much closer to home showed the need to confront anti-Muslim bigotry. […] Iowa representatives voted along party lines, with Democrat Cindy Axne supporting the measure and Republicans Randy Feenstra, Ashley Hinson and Mariannette Miller-Meeks voting no.” [Iowa Capital Dispatch, 12/15/21]

- Politico: The Office To Monitor And Combat Islamophobia Would Be Modeled After A Similar State Department Office Combating Anti-Semitism. “The Omar-led bill would establish an office within the State Department, led by a presidential appointee, to monitor and report Islamophobia worldwide — modeled on a similar State Department office that combats anti-Semitism globally.” [Politico, 12/14/21]
Gun Issues

Significant Findings

- 2019: Miller-Meeks said the 2nd Amendment right to bear arms allowed Americans to “support themselves against a government that becomes tyrannical.”
  - 2019: Miller-Meeks voted to add the right to bear arms to the Iowa Constitution.
- Miller-Meeks argued the assault weapons ban “failed nationally and will fail again if re-instated.”
- Miller-Meeks voted against bills to expand background checks on gun sales and close loopholes in the background check system, arguing they “would infringe upon the constitutional rights of law-abiding gun owners without addressing gun violence or protecting our communities.”
- 2020: Miller-Meeks voted to prohibit cities and counties in Iowa from enforcing gun laws stricter than state law.
- Miller-Meeks was endorsed by the National Rifle Association’s political arm in 2020, 2018, and 2014.
  - Miller-Meeks: “I’m a proud supporter of the NRA. My husband’s a member of the NRA.”
  - Miller-Meeks attended multiple “Friends of the NRA” banquets.
- Miller-Meeks threatened to oppose a bill funding the military over a proposed red flag provision.
- Miller-Meeks joined a letter urging ATF to withdraw proposed guidance on stabilizing braces.
  - Use of a stabilizing brace “effectively transforms a pistol into a short-barreled rifle — without requiring a background check.”
  - Stabilizing braces were used in mass shootings in Dayton, OH in 2019 and Boulder, CO in 2021.

2nd Amendment

2019: Miller-Meeks Said She Supported Citizens’ 2nd Amendment Rights “So That They Can Support Themselves Against A Government That Becomes Tyrannical”

2019: Miller-Meeks Said She Supported Citizens’ 2nd Amendment Rights “So That They Can Support Themselves Against A Government That Becomes Tyrannical.” “I believe the 2nd Amendment to be an individual right and that citizens have the right to bear arms per our constitution so that they can support themselves against a government that becomes tyrannical.” [YouTube, Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 11/14/19] (VIDEO) 00:00:13

Miller-Meeks: “I Believe The Second Amendment To Be An Individual Right, And That Citizens Have The Right To Bear Arms Per Our Constitution.” “Most of you already know that I spent time in the military 24 years between active duty and reserve. And I’m also married to an individual who spent 30 years in the military. My father was a hunter. I’m a strong supporter of the Second Amendment, I believe the second amendment to be an individual right, and that citizens have the right to bear arms per our Constitution, so that they can support
themselves against a government that becomes tyrannical. I don’t consider that only a right that goes to a national guard or a standing military because as we know, there was no standing military at the time that our founding fathers put forth the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.” [YouTube, Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 11/14/19] (VIDEO) 00:00:13


2019: Miller-Meeks Voted For SJR 18, A Joint Resolution To Add The Right To Bear Arms To The Iowa Constitution. Miller-Meeks Voted For SJR 18, “A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the State of Iowa relating to the right of the people to keep and bear arms.” The resolution passed 33-16. [Iowa State Legislature, SJR 18, 3/13/19]

- Miller-Meeks Said She Worked On A Pro-Gun Rights Resolution Aiming To Add A 2nd Amendment Protections To The Iowa Constitution. “While the Democratic nomination process has been quiet, the Republican nomination is hotly contested between Miller-Meeks and LeClaire businessman Bobby Schilling. In a statement about Reynolds endorsement, Miller-Meeks said her legislative record ‘championed’ Reynolds’ priorities in the 2019 session. She referenced the passage of a bill that banned most abortions after a fetal heartbeat was detected which was struck down in January 2019. She also mentioned her work to pass a bill that set up a children’s mental health system in Iowa and a pro-gun rights resolution aiming to add a 2nd Amendment protections to the Iowa Constitution.” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 11/8/19]

Assault Weapons Ban

Miller-Meeks: An Assault Weapons Ban “Failed Nationally And Will Fail Again If Re-Instated”

Miller-Meeks: An Assault Weapons Ban “Failed Nationally And Will Fail Again If Re-Instated.” “Failed nationally and will fail again if re-instated. Criminals get guns despite all the regulations & restrictions.” QUOTE TWEET @Reuters: “A federal judge overturned California's 32-year-old ban on assault weapons, describing it as a ‘failed experiment’ and prompting scathing criticism from the state's governor and attorney general reut.rs/2SgxcbA” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 6/5/21]

Background Checks And Loopholes

Miller-Meeks Voted Against HR 1446, Closing The Charleston Loophole

Miller-Meeks Voted Against Extending The Timeframe For FBI Notification On Background Checks To 20 Days, From Three Days Under Current Law. In March 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against: “Passage of the bill, as amended, that would require a licensed gun dealer to wait up to 20 business days, as opposed to three under current law, for notification from the FBI regarding an individual's background check before completing the sale or transfer of a firearm. Specifically, it would allow a prospective gun purchaser to petition the Justice Department to complete the sale after 10 days if no determination on their eligibility has been made through the National Instant Criminal Background Check System and allow the dealer to complete the transaction an additional 10 days after the petition is submitted. It would also require the Government Accountability Office, FBI and Justice Department to
submit a number of reports regarding the bill’s effectiveness and implementation, including on the number of petitions not adjudicated within the second 10-day period and the bill's effect on the safety of victims of domestic violence and sexual assault.” The bill passed by a vote of 219-210. [HR 1446, Vote #77, 3/11/21; CQ, 3/11/21]

- **HR 1446 Would Extend The Period For Gun Background Checks From 3 Days Under Current Law To Close The “Charleston Loophole,” Named For The 2015 Mass Shooting There.** “The House passed two bills Thursday that would tighten gun sales regulations, sending the measures to a divided Senate. H.R. 8 would expand background checks on individuals seeking to purchase or transfer firearms, and the Enhanced Background Checks Act of 2021 would close the ‘Charleston loophole,’ a gap in federal law that lets gun sales proceed without a completed background check if three businesses days have passed […] The other bill passed Thursday, H.R. 1446, is linked to a shooting in 2015 in Charleston, South Carolina, where a white supremacist used the loophole to obtain firearms he used to kill nine Black people during a Bible study at Mother Emanuel AME Church.” [USA Today, 3/11/21]

**Miller-Meeks Voted Against HR 8, Expanding Background Checks And Closing The Gun Show Loophole**

**Miller-Meeks Voted Against Expanding Background Checks To Include Most Gun Sales, Including Those Between Private Parties.** In March 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against: “Passage of the bill, as amended, that would require most purchasers of firearms to undergo a background check through the FBI National Instant Criminal Background Check System. Specifically, beginning 180 days after enactment, it would require any individual seeking to transfer a firearm to first bring the firearm to a licensed dealer. It would require the dealer to take possession of the firearm, complete a background check on the transferee, and return the firearm to its original owner if the transaction is denied. The bill would make a number of exceptions to the requirement, including for loans or gifts between family members; temporary transfers for hunting, use on a shooting range, or pest control by farmers; temporary transfers to prevent imminent death or bodily harm, including self-harm; and transfers to law enforcement personnel, private security professionals, or members of the armed forces, if associated with official duties.” The bill passed by a vote of 227-203. [HR 8, Vote #75, 3/11/21; CQ, 3/11/21]

- **HR 8 Would Expand The Cases Where A Background Check Is Required For Gun Sales, Closing The “Gun Show Loophole.”** “H.R. 8, a background checks package meant to enhance reviews of those seeking firearms, would not create a registry or other federal mechanisms for review. Instead, the legislation would expand the cases in which a background check is required for the sale or transfer of a firearm, including for private individuals and groups, closing the ‘Gun Show Loophole.’ The requirements would apply to online sales. The bill would make it illegal for anyone who is not a licensed firearm importer, manufacturer or dealer to trade or sell firearms to another person; current federal law requires background checks only for licensed gun dealers.” [USA Today, 3/11/21]

**Miller-Meeks Said HR 8 And HR 1446 “Would Infringe Upon The Constitutional Rights Of Law-Abiding Gun Owners Without Addressing Gun Violence Or Protecting Our Communities”**

**Miller-Meeks Said HR 8 And HR 1446 “Would Infringe Upon The Constitutional Rights Of Law-Abiding Gun Owners Without Addressing Gun Violence Or Protecting Our Communities.”** “Today, March 11th, 2021, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02) released the following statement after voting NO on both H.R. 8 and H.R. 1446. ‘Both pieces of legislation I voted against today would infringe upon the Constitutional rights of law-abiding gun owners without addressing gun violence or protecting our communities. As a lifelong gun owner, I believe that the Second Amendment is too important to my fellow Iowans to be trampled on in this manner.’” [Office of Rep. Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 3/11/21]
**2020: Miller-Meeks Voted To Prohibit Cities And Counties In Iowa From Enforcing Gun Laws Stricter Than State Law**

**2020: Miller-Meeks Voted For HF 2502, Which Addressed Gun Carrying, Storage, And Possession.** Miller-Meeks voted for HF 2502, “a bill for an act relating to firearms and weapons, including the storage, carrying, possession, or transportation of weapons and the establishment, use, and maintenance of shooting ranges.” The bill passed by vote 32-17. [Iowa State Legislature, HF 2502, 6/3/20]

- **HF 2502 Barred Political Subdivisions From Legislating Gun Ownership, Transfer, And Modification.** “The Bill expands the existing prohibition of a political subdivision enacting any ordinance regulating the ownership, possession, transfer, transportation, registration, and licensing of firearms to include the modification of firearms, and adds firearm attachments and other weapons to the list of items prohibited from regulation by local law. Section 3 of the Bill also provides that beginning July 1, 2020, any individual adversely affected by a political subdivision’s ordinance or similar policy regulating firearms may take legal action to seek damages that have resulted out of the violation. Should the affected individual’s legal action prove successful, the presiding court shall also award the individual reasonable attorney fees and litigation costs.” [Iowa State Legislature, HF 2502 Fiscal Note, 6/2/20]

- **The Bill Prohibited Cities And Counties From Enforcing Restrictions That Go Further Than State Law On Using Firearms At Shooting Ranges And Carrying Weapons On School Grounds, At County Courthouses And Businesses.** “House File 2502, awaiting Gov. Kim Reynolds’ signature, prohibits cities and counties from enforcing restrictions that go further than state law on using firearms at shooting ranges and carrying weapons on school grounds, at county courthouses and businesses. The bill states certain restrictions only can be imposed on people seeking to carry firearms into a public building that screens for weapons and has armed guards. Beginning July 1, the bill prohibits local governments from enacting an ordinance, motion, resolution or amendment to regulate the storage of weapons or ammunition and states that “any individual adversely affected” by a city or county policy regulating firearms “may take legal action to seek damages that have resulted out of the violation.” [Iowa Starting Line, 6/24/20]

**National Rifle Association**

**Miller-Meeks Was Endorsed By NRA-PVF In 2020, 2018, And 2014**

**2020: NRA-PVF Endorsed Miller-Meeks In The 2nd Congressional District.** “Dear Iowa NRA Member: Please vote Mariannette Miller-Meeks for the U.S. House of Representatives on or before Tuesday, November 3, 2020. Requested absentee ballots have been mailed and in-person absentee voting is underway. The NRA Political Victory Fund (NRA-PVF) has endorsed Mariannette Miller-Meeks for the U.S. House of Representatives in the 2nd Congressional District of Iowa. Mariannette is a staunch defender of the Second Amendment and has earned your vote by protecting your fundamental right to self-defense from those who attempt to eradicate it!” [NRA-PVF, Email, accessed 12/7/21]

**2018: NRA-PVF Endorsed Miller-Meeks In Iowa’s 41st Senate District.** “Dear Iowa NRA Member: Tuesday, November 6, is Election Day and your freedom is on the line! Your NRA Political Victory Fund has endorsed Mariannette Miller-Meeks in Iowa Senate District 41. Mariannette Miller-Meeks NRA Endorsed Mariannette Miller-Meeks is a strong supporter of our Second Amendment rights and needs your vote to win. Support the candidate who will fight for your rights! It is important that you vote Mariannette Miller-Meeks for state Senator on Tuesday, November 6. Encourage your family, friends, and fellow gun owners to do the same.” [NRA-PVF, Email, accessed 12/7/21]

**2014: NRA-PVF Endorsed Miller-Meeks In The 2nd Congressional District.** “Dear Iowa NRA Member: On behalf of our five million members across the country, The National Rifle Association Political Victory Fund (NRA-PVF) is proud to endorse Mariannette Miller-Meeks for U.S. House of Representatives in Iowa’s 2nd
Congressional District. Early voting is available September 25th-November 3rd. Absentee ballots must be received by Tuesday, November 4th. For more information on voting, please call 1-515-281-5204 or click here.” [NRA-PVF, Email, accessed 12/7/21]

Miller-Meeks: “I’m A Proud Supporter Of The NRA. My Husband’s A Member Of The NRA”

Miller-Meeks: “I’m A Proud Supporter Of The NRA. My Husband’s A Member Of The NRA.” “So I’m a proud supporter of the NRA. My husband’s a member of the NRA, and I’m a proud supporter of our Second Amendment rights to bear arms.” [YouTube, Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 11/14/19] (VIDEO) 00:00:42

2021: Miller-Meeks Attended A “Friends Of The NRA” Banquet In Ottumwa. “The Friends of the NRA banquet in Ottumwa last night had great attendance, good food courtesy of Bridgeview and people very excited to get together again.” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 10/24/21]

2019: Miller-Meeks Attended A “Friends Of The NRA” Banquet. “@millermeeks: Rounded out the evening with friends and many senate constituents at the ‘Friends of the NRA’ banquet. Not a bad way to end a busy day.” [Instagram, @millermeeks, 9/21/19]

Red Flag Laws

Miller-Meeks Threatened To Vote Against The NDAA Over A Red Flag Provision

September 2021: Miller-Meeks Joined A Letter Demanding The Removal Of A Red Flag Provision In The FY2022 National Defense Authorization Act. “WASHINGTON, D.C.—Today, September 29th, 2021, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02) joined a letter to the Chairmen and Ranking Members of the House and Senate Armed Services Committees, demanding the full removal of a ‘red flag’ provision in H.R. 4350, the House National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA), during the conference committee process. ‘I am strongly opposed to ‘red flag laws,’ which are unconstitutional laws that violate the due-process rights of gun owners. I am opposed to the inclusion of these provisions in the NDAA and it is imperative that we remove them from the NDAA before the House votes on this legislation again,’ said Miller-Meeks. ‘I voted for the NDAA with the understanding that any possible ‘red flag’ provisions will be removed from the final version of the bill. If they are not removed, I will not vote for the bill when it returns to the House for final passage. I fully expect that the red flag provisions will be eliminated in the final version of the NDAA, and I look forward to voting on a final version of the bill that funds our military and protects the due-process rights of our servicemembers.’” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 9/29/21]

Miller-Meeks In September 2021: “If Red Flag Laws Remain In The Final Version Of The NDAA, I Will Not Support It.” “Completely agree with @ChuckGrassley. If red flag laws remain in the final version of the NDAA, I will not support it. #IA02” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 9/30/21]

Stabilizing Braces

Miller-Meeks Joined A Letter Urging ATF To Withdraw Proposed Guidance On Stabilizing Braces Like Those Used In Mass Shootings

Miller-Meeks Joined A Letter Urging The Bureau Of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, And Explosives (ATF) To Withdraw Proposed Guidance On Stabilizing Braces. “Today, June 15th, 2021, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02) joined 140 Members of the House of Representatives urging the Department of Justice to withdraw proposed guidance on Stabilizing Braces. In a letter to Attorney General Merrick Garland and Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives (ATF) Acting Director Marvin Richardson, the Members warn that this guidance will make millions of law-abiding citizens, including disabled veterans, criminals overnight.”
proposed guidance is alarming and jeopardizes the rights of law-abiding gun owners and disabled combat veterans across the country,’ the Members write. ‘Should this guidance go into effect, a disabled combat veteran who has chosen the best stabilizing brace for their disability is now a felon unless they turn in or destroy the firearm, destroy the brace, or pay a $200 tax. Furthermore, it could make millions of law-abiding citizens felons overnight. We urge you to take action to correct this injustice immediately by withdrawing this proposed guidance.’” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 6/15/21]

• **Miller-Meeks: “This Rule Directly Targets Law-Abiding Gun Owners By Heavily Taxing A Popular Pistol And Stabilizer Used By Many Disabled Veterans.”** “Iowa’s three Republicans in the U.S. House of Representatives have signed a letter calling on the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF) to do away with proposed guidance on stabilizing braces for some guns. […] Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02) – ‘The proposed guidance from the ATF is alarming as it would encroach on the Constitutional rights of thousands of Americans. This rule directly targets law-abiding gun owners by heavily taxing a popular pistol and stabilizer used by many disabled veterans. I will always stand up for the Second Amendment and I believe it should not be infringed upon.”’ [WOI, 6/24/21]

• **The Letter Miller-Meeks Joined Called Proposed Guidance On Stabilizing Braces “A Direct Tax On Disabled Combat Veterans.”** “In their letter, Members outline that the ATF has repeatedly stated, ‘the brace concept was inspired by the needs of disabled combat veterans who still enjoy recreational shooting but could not reliably control heavy pistols without assistance.’ As the ATF acknowledges there are legitimate uses for certain stabilizing braces, the letter points out that including a $200 tax in the ATF rule is not an attempt to curb gun violence as suggested, but a direct tax on disabled combat veterans. Furthermore, the Members highlight uncertainties in the ATF’s proposed guidance and the troubling omission of a process for disabled veterans to report a disability exempting them from this rule.” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 6/15/21]

• **According To ATF, The Proposed Rule “Would Not Affect ‘Stabilizing Braces’ That Are Objectively Designed And Intended As A ‘Stabilizing Brace’ For Use By Individuals With Disabilities.”** “This proposed rule would not affect ‘stabilizing braces’ that are objectively designed and intended as a ‘stabilizing brace’ for use by individuals with disabilities, and not for shouldering the weapon as a rifle. Such stabilizing braces are designed to conform to the arm and not as a buttstock.” [Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives, accessed 12/6/21]

---

**Stabilizing Braces Like Those Used In Mass Shootings “Effectively Transform[ed] A Pistol Into A Short-Barreled Rifle — Without Requiring A Background Check”**

**Bloomberg Law: Use Of A Stabilizing Brace “Effectively Transforms A Pistol Into A Short-Barreled Rifle — Without Requiring A Background Check.”** “The Biden administration is in the final stages of drafting a regulation on firearm accessories that can be used to make pistols more like rifles, part of the White House’s broader effort to tackle gun violence without involving Congress. The White House received the Justice Department’s proposal to regulate stabilizing braces on Monday, according to the White House regulatory office’s website. The firearm accessory can make pistols more accurate and deadlier. It effectively transforms a pistol into a short-barreled rifle — without requiring a background check.” [Bloomberg Law, 5/18/21]

• **Stabilizing Braces Were Used By Gunmen In The Mass Shooting Events In Boulder, Colorado In 2021 And Dayton, Ohio In 2019.** “This type of stabilizing device was used in March 2021 when a gunman killed 10 people in Boulder, Colorado, and in August 2019 when a shooter killed nine people in Dayton, Ohio.” [Giffords, accessed 12/6/21]
### Health Care Issues

#### Significant Findings

- Miller-Meeks was a staunch opponent of the Affordable Care Act, which she claimed failed to lower premiums and limited patient choice of insurance and providers.

- Miller-Meeks “has been on the record about her support for repealing the ACA” and had said Congress needed to prepare for if it was overturned by the Supreme Court.

- Miller-Meeks said she had always supported protections for pre-existing conditions, but an ad’s claim that “Miller-Meeks supported a plan that would allow insurers to deny health care coverage because of preexisting conditions” received an “A” grade from a Cedar Rapids Gazette fact check.

- 2021: Miller-Meeks voted against fixing Medicare sequestration, saying Democrats had chosen “a short-term fix” and complaining that the issue had been tied to the debt limit.

- 2019-2020: Miller-Meeks voted 4 times to tighten eligibility requirements for Medicaid.

- 2018: Miller-Meeks acknowledged problems with the implementation of Medicaid privatization in Iowa that she said may need to be worked out legislatively.

- 2010: Miller-Meeks said congress needed to cut spending and “root out well known and documented waste in entitlement programs like Medicare and Medicaid.”

- 2021: Miller-Meeks opposed allowing Medicare to negotiate lower prescription drug prices.
  - Miller-Meeks said allowing the government to control drug prices would lead to “rationing of care” based on “how valuable your life is.”

- 2019: Miller-Meeks said health care prices were “an issue that helps people not overutilize health care.”

- 2019: Miller-Meeks supported Trump’s policy that required hospitals to publish prices of their services, despite criticism the policy would drive up costs.

- 2021: Miller-Meeks quote-tweeted an editorial that claimed the goal of the vaccine patent waiver was to erode pharmaceutical intellectual property rights.

- 2010: Miller-Meeks supported medical advances in stem cell research, but opposed “any measure that allows life to be created only to have it destroyed.”

- 2010: Miller-Meeks said she wanted to “save $60 billion over 10 years by capping rewards derived from medical lawsuits.”

- Miller-Meeks said expanding rural health care was one of her top priorities and that there was a need to boost access to and insurance coverage of telehealth.

### Affordable Care Act (ACA)
Miller-Meeks Was A Staunth Opponent Of The Affordable Care Act, Which She Claimed Failed To Lower Premiums And Limited Patient Choice Of Insurance And Providers

Miller-Meeks Said The ACA Failed To Provide Affordable Health Care Choices “Rather Than Putting Bureaucrats In Between You And Your Doctor.” “Health care became a focal issue in the race, with Hart and Miller-Meeks campaigns sparring over each other's records over support for protecting health insurance coverage for Iowans with pre-existing conditions and handling of the pandemic. [...] Miller-Meeks, an ophthalmologist and former director of the Iowa Department of Public Health, has insisted she has always supported protections for pre-existing conditions. However, she said the ACA has failed to lower insurance premiums and provide affordable, accessible health care that provides choice ‘rather than putting bureaucrats in between you and your doctor.’ Miller-Meeks has said she backs efforts by House Republicans to put forth legislation that would continue to provide protections and coverage for Americans with pre-existing conditions, should the law be overturned by the court.” [Quad-City Times, 11/4/20]

October 2020: Miller-Meeks Said She Supported Protections For Pre-Existing Conditions But That The Affordable Care Act Had Not Brought Down The Price Of Health Care Premiums Or Allowed Choice. “Democrats have criticized Miller-Meeks for her past support of repealing the Affordable Care Act. ‘We agree that the next few years will be critical when it comes to improving Americans' health care,’ Hart campaign spokesman Riley Kilburg said in a statement. ‘Unfortunately, Mariannette Miller-Meeks supports repealing the Affordable Care Act, which would eliminate protections for those living with pre-existing conditions and coverage for essential health benefits — all while stripping more than 230,000 Iowans of their care during a pandemic. That’s not the approach Iowans need.’ Miller-Meeks has said she supports protections for pre-existing conditions and would back efforts by House Republicans to continue to provide such protections and coverage for Americans, should the law be overturned by the U.S. Supreme Court. But, she has argued the ACA has failed to bring down the price of premiums and allow choice.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 10/21/20]

Miller-Meeks Insisted She Had Always Supported Protections For Pre-Existing Conditions But That Under The ACA Health Care Premiums Had Gone Up And Would Continue To Rise. “Hart and national Democrats have criticized Miller-Meeks for her past support of repealing the Affordable Care Act. […] Miller-Meeks insisted she has always supported protections for pre-existing conditions; however, ‘(health care premiums) have gone up and they've continued to go up.’ ‘We need health care that is affordable, accessible, portable and still allows us to have choice,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘Employers are now looking at an average policy around $21,000 and employees' portion is around $5,500. ... We haven't made health insurance more affordable and we haven't made it portable. However, we did get more access to care. I appreciate that there was more people covered under insurance, but the other avenues ... were not addressed. Allowing people to purchase medical insurance state lines, tort reform, allowing more choice are all things that can help to lower cost.’” [Quad-City Times, 10/12/20]

- October 2020: Miller-Meeks Said That Because Of The Affordable Care Act, “Employers Are Now Looking At An Average Policy Around $21,000 And Employees' Portion Is Around $5,500.” “Hart and national Democrats have criticized Miller-Meeks for her past support of repealing the Affordable Care Act. […] Miller-Meeks insisted she has always supported protections for pre-existing conditions; however, ‘(health care premiums) have gone up and they've continued to go up.’ ‘We need health care that is affordable, accessible, portable and still allows us to have choice,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘Employers are now looking at an average policy around $21,000 and employees’ portion is around $5,500. ... We haven't made health insurance more affordable and we haven't made it portable. However, we did get more access to care. I appreciate that there was more people covered under insurance, but the other avenues ... were not addressed. Allowing people to purchase medical insurance state lines, tort reform, allowing more choice are all things that can help to lower cost.’” [Quad-City Times, 10/12/20]

Miller-Meeks On The Affordable Care Act: “We Haven't Made Health Insurance More Affordable And We Haven't Made It Portable. However, We Did Get More Access To Care.” “Hart and national Democrats have criticized Miller-Meeks for her past support of repealing the Affordable Care Act. […] Miller-Meeks insisted she has always supported protections for pre-existing conditions; however, ‘(health care premiums) have gone up and
they've continued to go up.’ ‘We need health care that is affordable, accessible, portable and still allows us to have choice,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘Employers are now looking at an average policy around $21,000 and employees' portion is around $5,500. ... We haven't made health insurance more affordable and we haven't made it portable. However, we did get more access to care. I appreciate that there was more people covered under insurance, but the other avenues ... were not addressed. Allowing people to purchase medical insurance state lines, tort reform, allowing more choice are all things that can help to lower cost.’” [Quad-City Times, 10/12/20]

**September 2020: Miller-Meeks Said The “ACA Did Not Bring Costs Down.”** “Miller-Meeks insisted she has always supported protections for preexisting conditions; however, the ‘ACA did not bring costs down.’ ‘What's more important is: How do we get affordable, accessible health care that's portable?’ she said. ‘How do we keep costs down? And there's way to do it’ through more pricing transparency.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 9/25/20]

**2019: Miller-Meeks Claimed The ACA Had Caused Increased Premiums And Drug Prices Through Triggering Consolidation Of Medical Practices And Hospitals**

2019: Miller-Meeks Claimed The ACA Had Caused Increased Premiums And Drug Prices Through Triggering Consolidation Of Medical Practices And Hospitals. “Also with the Affordable Care Act we saw premiums increase dramatically, we saw drug prices go up dramatically, we’ve seen consolidation of hospitals to larger hospital systems, and we’ve also seen consolidation of small independent physician practices into larger practices or consumed by hospital or health care systems. All of this has led to increased costs, so absolutely what happens at the federal government level affects me every single day and how I can deliver the best care, the highest quality care, the most accessible care possible to my patients.” [YouTube, Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 11/14/19] (VIDEO) 00:02:55

**2019: Miller-Meeks Said Electronic Medical Records Use Mandated By The ACA Was “Very Cumbersome And Takes A Lot Of Time” And Robbed Patients Of Face Time With Providers**

Miller-Meeks Said The Use Of Electronic Medical Records Mandated By The ACA Was “Very Cumbersome And Takes A Lot Of Time” And Robbed Patients Of Face Time With Providers. “We’re now mandated to do electronic health records after the Affordable Care Act went through. And the electronic health records, while they may allow transmission of information, we don’t necessarily always have the data that we need, and it’s very cumbersome and takes a lot of time. It’s led to a lot of frustration in the provider community, whether you’re a doctor, a nurse practitioner or physician’s assistant, whether you’re an emergency room provider, it’s led to so much frustration within the healthcare community that we’re spending more and more time on an electronic record with our back towards our patient and less and less face to face time.” [YouTube, Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 11/14/19] (VIDEO) 00:02:17

**2020: Miller-Meeks Suggested Allowing Medical Insurance To Be Purchased Over State Lines Would Help Lower The Cost Of Insurance**

Miller-Meeks: “Allowing People To Purchase Medical Insurance State Lines, Tort Reform, Allowing More Choice Are All Things That Can Help To Lower Cost.” “Hart and national Democrats have criticized Miller-Meeks for her past support of repealing the Affordable Care Act. […] Miller-Meeks insisted she has always supported protections for pre-existing conditions; however, ‘(health care premiums) have gone up and they've continued to go up.’ ‘We need health care that is affordable, accessible, portable and still allows us to have choice,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘Employers are now looking at an average policy around $21,000 and employees' portion is around $5,500. ... We haven’t made health insurance more affordable and we haven't made it portable. However, we did get more access to care. I appreciate that there was more people covered under insurance, but the other avenues ... were not addressed. Allowing people to purchase medical insurance state lines, tort reform, allowing more choice are all things that can help to lower cost.’” [Quad-City Times, 10/12/20]
September 2020: Iowa City Press-Citizen: Miller-Meeks “Has Been On The Record About Her Support For Repealing The ACA” And Said Congress Needed To Prepare For If It Was Overturned By The Supreme Court. “Like the Republican colleagues she hopes to join, Miller-Meeks has been on the record about her support for repealing the ACA. During Thursday's debate, she said Congress needs to prepare for replacing it. ‘Given that this is coming to the Supreme Court in the next month, I think Congress needs to - in a bipartisan way - both parties get together and work on what happens should the ACA be overturned. We don't know if it will be, but we need to start working on that provision right now. And make sure people continue to have coverage and preexisting conditions are covered as well,’ Miller-Meeks said.” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 9/28/20]

September 2020: Miller-Meeks Said That A Trump Executive Order To Address Surprise Medical Billing And Protect Pre-Existing Conditions Would Not Solve The Problems Following A Potential Supreme Court Decision. “White House officials this week announced that President Donald Trump will sign an executive order to address surprise medical billing and safeguard insurance for people with existing medical conditions, even as his administration backs a Supreme Court challenge that could undo such protections. Miller-Meeks said such an order wouldn't solve the problem, should the U.S. Supreme Court rule the health law unconstitutional, ‘but it certainly helps set a framework and some groundwork’ for Congress to pass new health care provisions. ‘We need to start working on that provision now, and make sure people continue to have coverage, and preexisting conditions are covered as well,’ Miller-Meeks said.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 9/25/20]

2020: Women Vote! Ran A TV Ad Claiming Miller-Meeks Supported A Plan That Could Cost 187,000 Iowans Their Insurance Coverage And Fail To Protect For Pre-Existing Conditions

September 2020: Women Vote! Ran An Ad Claiming “Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Who Took Thousands From Big Insurance, Supported A Plan That Could Cost 187,000 Iowans Their Coverage Or Let Insurers Deny It Because Of Preexisting Conditions, Like Diabetes.” “One of those ads is by Women Vote!, a Super PAC of Emily's List, a network formed in 1985 with the goal of electing more pro-abortion rights Democratic women to office. The 30-second ad starts by mentioning COVID-19 and showing images of damage from the Aug. 10 derecho. 'During a pandemic, in the wake of a disaster, losing your health insurance would be devastating,' the voice says. The ad claims 'Mariannette Miller-Meeks, who took thousands from big insurance, supported a plan that could cost 187,000 Iowans their coverage or let insurers deny it because of preexisting conditions, like diabetes.'” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 9/28/20]

A Fact-Check By The Cedar Rapids Gazette Gave The Women Vote! Ad A “B” Grade Overall, Saying Miller-Meeks “Has Been Vocal About Wanting To Get Rid Of" The Affordable Care Act

A Fact-Check By The Cedar Rapids Gazette Gave The Women Vote! Ad A “B” Grade Overall. “The attacks in this ad against Mariannette Miller-Meeks are similar to those against other Republicans in congressional races across the country. PolitiFact scored a nearly identical ad 'true' in the 7th District contest in Virginia. That ad says Republican challenger Nick Frietas 'supports a plan letting insurance companies deny coverage for preexisting conditions like asthma or diabetes.' While Miller-Meeks hasn't served in Congress and hasn't had a chance to vote on a repeal of the Affordable Care Act, she has been vocal about wanting to get rid of it. If Women Vote! had stopped after the first three claims, the group would have gotten an A overall. But the fourth claim, which got a D, sinks the check to a B.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 9/28/20]

Cedar Rapids Gazette: “While Miller-Meeks Hasn't Served In Congress And Hasn't Had A Chance To Vote On A Repeal Of The Affordable Care Act, She Has Been Vocal About Wanting To Get Rid Of It.” “While Miller-Meeks hasn't served in Congress and hasn't had a chance to vote on a repeal of the Affordable Care Act, she has been vocal about wanting to get rid of it.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 9/28/20]
The Cedar Rapids Gazette Fact-Check Gave The Claim That Miller-Meeks Had Accepted $304,000 In Campaign Donations From The Insurance And Health Care Industries An “A” Grade. “The first, which appears as screen text, says Miller-Meeks accepted $304,000 in campaign donations from the insurance and health care industries. Women Vote! gets this number by adding together two numbers from the Center for Responsive Politics, which tracks money donated to U.S. House and Senate candidates using filings to the Federal Election Commission. First, the center’s Open Secrets website shows Miller-Meeks, an ophthalmologist and former Iowa Department of Public Health director, accepted, in the course of her political career, $297,582 in donations from people and PACs in the health industry. Miller-Meeks has run unsuccessfully for the 2nd District seat three other times before 2020. Open Secrets reported Miller-Meeks accepted $12,405 from donors in the finance/insurance/real estate industry. Together, that equals $309,987, which is higher than the total in the ad because Women Vote! pulled the data for the ad on Aug. 21. Grade: A.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 9/28/20]

Cedar Rapids Gazette: Miller-Meeks Said She “Supported An Overhaul Or Repeal” Of The Affordable care Act When She Ran For Congress In 2014. “Claim 2: The second claim is that Miller-Meeks' supported a plan that could cost 187,000 Iowans their coverage.' The ad doesn't say specifically which plan they're talking about, but a citation to a Center for American Progress article talks about the Affordable Care Act, or Obamacare. Miller-Meeks has never been in Congress, so she didn't vote against the act when it was approved in 2010. But she did say in 2014, when she was running for the 2nd District against incumbent Democrat Dave Loebsack, she supported an overhaul or repeal of the law. 'Looking at the Affordable Care Act, there are ways we can change it, modify it, and/or, if possible, repeal it, but you have to gain the Senate, but at least, let's make it work for people,' Miller-Meeks said in a Feb. 27, 2014, article in the Daily Iowan. She also tweeted her opposition to the law while she was state Public Health director, the Des Moines Register reported in 2014. In a debate Thursday, Miller-Meeks said she always has supported protections for preexisting conditions and that any repeal would have to come with a new health care law, the Quad-City Times reported. 'It just doesn't make sense that we're going to jerk this away without a plan in place,' she said. [...] Women Vote! is right — underplaying even — the number of Iowans who depend on the Affordable Care Act for health care and Miller-Meeks’ past comments about being willing to consider repeal. We give this claim an A.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 9/28/20]

Cedar Rapids Gazette: “Women Vote! Is Right — Underplaying Even — The Number Of Iowans Who Depend On The Affordable Care Act For Health Care And Miller-Meeks’ Past Comments About Being Willing To Consider Repeal.” “Claim 2: The second claim is that Miller-Meeks ‘supported a plan that could cost 187,000 Iowans their coverage.' The ad doesn't say specifically which plan they're talking about, but a citation to a Center for American Progress article talks about the Affordable Care Act, or Obamacare. [...] So the question is how many Iowans would lose coverage if the health law was repealed. This number comes from two groups. First are Iowans enrolled in health care exchanges through the act, of which there were 49,210 in 2019. The Gazette reported. The number came from a report by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. Second are Iowans who are enrolled in the Iowa Health and Wellness Program, which is the state's expansion of Medicaid allowed through the act. There were 195,059 Iowans in the most recent enrollment, the Iowa Department of Human Services reported. These two numbers add up to 244,269 Iowans who could lose their health care coverage if the law was repealed. Grade: Women Vote! is right — underplaying even — the number of Iowans who depend on the Affordable Care Act for health care and Miller-Meeks’ past comments about being willing to consider repeal. We give this claim an A.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 9/28/20]

The Cedar Rapids Gazette Fact-Check Gave The Claim “Miller-Meeks Supported A Plan That Would Allow Insurers To Deny Health Care Coverage Because Of Preexisting Conditions” An “A” Grade. “Claim 3: The third claim is that Miller-Meeks supported a plan that would allow insurers to deny health care coverage because of preexisting conditions, including diabetes. Several Republican-proposed bills would have offered less protection for people with preexisting conditions, FactCheck.org reported in April 2019. The American Health Care Act, for example, would have required insurers to offer coverage despite preexisting conditions, but they could charge more in some cases. The House passed the legislation in 2017, but the Senate never voted on it. The House GOP bill also would have given states the option of setting their own list of essential benefits insurance companies had to cover, which could mean some services wouldn't be covered, FactCheck.org reported. Grade: A.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 9/28/20]
In 2010, Miller-Meeks Called For The Repeal Of The Affordable Care Act...

Miller-Meeks Called For A “Repeal And Replace” Of The ACA. “While calling herself an independent conservative, Miller-Meeks is following the Republican call for a ‘repeal and replace’ of the health care reform legislation signed into law late last month. She said the bill that passed is not all bad but the good is well outweighed by the negatives. She favors the provisions of not denying people coverage for having pre-existing conditions and for allowing adult children to remain on their parents’ insurance until age 26. ‘I think those were reforms that could have been incorporated without going to the extent that they did,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘To me, our country had a tremendous opportunity to revamp our health care system in a way that was patient-centered and not government-mandated and that could be the model for the rest of the world. And we missed that opportunity.’”[The Hawk Eye, 4/7/10]

Miller-Meeks: “I Would Repeal-And-Replace This Law With Reforms That Actually Reduce Health Care Costs, Increase Portability While Increasing Accessibility”

Miller-Meeks: “I Would Repeal-And-Replace This Law With Reforms That Actually Reduce Health Care Costs, Increase Portability While Increasing Accessibility.” According to Miller-Meeks for Congress 2010 website under “Reform Health Care Without a Government-Run System”, Miller-Meeks said “The reforms as currently outlined fail to address exploding costs, and transfers those unsustainable costs to taxpayers by empowering the government to take-over health care. This reform puts bureaucrats between doctors and patients, which will destroy the quality of health care as we know it. While there are many attractive measures contained in the health reform law like covering pre-existing conditions and extending coverage for young adults on their parent’s plans, I would repeal-and-replace this law with reforms that actually reduce health care costs, increase portability while increasing accessibility.” [Miller-Meeks for Congress 2010, accessed 6/15/20]

Miller-Meeks Suggested “Keeping The Parts That Are Beneficial To Us,’ But Repealing Or Defunding The Rest”

Miller-Meeks Suggested “‘Keeping The Parts That Are Beneficial To Us,’ But Repealing Or Defunding The Rest.” “On health care reform, she suggested ‘keeping the parts that are beneficial to us,’ but repealing or defunding the rest. Diners at all-you-can-eat buffets pile their food high because they’re trying to get their money’s worth, and it’s the same with health care, she said. ‘Insurance is supposed to be used for catastrophies, but people end up taking every (service) they can that’s in front of them,’ she said, adding that rationing health care will be an important part of the reform whether or not the Democrats acknowledge it.” [Muscatine Journal, 7/19/10]

Miller-Meeks Said Obama’s Health Care Bill Shows The Worst Part Of The Health Care System, And Health Care Costs Will Not Come Down Under The Plan

Miller-Meeks Said Obama’s Health Care Bill Shows The Worst Part Of The Health Care System, And Health Care Costs Will Not Come Down Under The Plan. “Miller-Meeks said the health care reform passed by Congress and signed by President Barack Obama ‘shows the worst part of our health care system and doesn’t show the leadership we should have shown. ‘Health care costs will not come down under this bill,’ she said, ‘and that’s a tragedy because they’re too high in this country.’ Miller-Meeks said a health care plan needs to put power back in existing conditions and for allowing adult children to remain on their parents’ insurance until age 26. ‘I think those were reforms that could have been incorporated without going to the extent that they did,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘To me, our country had a tremendous opportunity to revamp our health care system in a way that was patient-centered and not government-mandated and that could be the model for the rest of the world. And we missed that opportunity.’”[The Hawk Eye, 4/7/10]

Miller-Meeks Said She Supported Popular Provisions Of The Affordable Care Act, Including Pre-Existing Conditions Protections And Allowing Young People To Stay On Their Parents’ Insurance

Miller-Meeks Favored Not Denying People Coverage For Having Pre-Existing Conditions. “While calling herself an independent conservative, Miller-Meeks is following the Republican call for a ‘repeal and replace’ of the health care reform legislation signed into law late last month. She said the bill that passed is not all bad but the good
is well outweighed by the negatives. She favors the provisions of not denying people coverage for having pre-existing conditions and for allowing adult children to remain on their parents’ insurance until age 26. ‘I think those were reforms that could have been incorporated without going to the extent that they did,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘To me, our country had a tremendous opportunity to revamp our health care system in a way that was patient-centered and not government-mandated and that could be the model for the rest of the world. And we missed that opportunity.’” [The Hawk Eye, 4/7/10]

**Miller-Meeks Supported Allowing Young Adults To Stay On Their Parents’ Insurance Until Age 26.** “While calling herself an independent conservative, Miller-Meeks is following the Republican call for a ‘repeal and replace’ of the health care reform legislation signed into law late last month. She said the bill that passed is not all bad but the good is well outweighed by the negatives. She favors the provisions of not denying people coverage for having pre-existing conditions and for allowing adult children to remain on their parents’ insurance until age 26. ‘I think those were reforms that could have been incorporated without going to the extent that they did,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘To me, our country had a tremendous opportunity to revamp our health care system in a way that was patient-centered and not government-mandated and that could be the model for the rest of the world. And we missed that opportunity.’” [The Hawk Eye, 4/7/10]

**Miller-MeeksSupported Allowing Young Adults To Stay On Their Parents’ Insurance Until Age 26.**

**Miller-Meeks Favoring Implementing Tort Reform, Individual Ownership Of Insurance Plans And Interstate Purchasing Of Insurance Plans To Help Cut Health Care Costs**

**Miller-Meeks Claimed The ACA Required Corporations And Business Owners To File Separate Forms For The Internal Revenue Service For Each Contractor Who Is Paid $600 Or More A Year**

**Miller-Meeks Claimed The ACA Required Corporations And Business Owners To File Separate Forms For The Internal Revenue Service For Each Contractor Who Is Paid $600 Or More A Year**

…And Miller-Meeks Said She Would Repeal The Affordable Care Act In February 2014…

**Feb. 2014: Miller-Meeks Said “Looking At The Affordable Care Act, There Are Ways We Can Change It, Modify It, And/Or, If Possible, Repeal It.”** “‘Looking at the Affordable Care Act, there are ways we can change it, modify it, and/or, if possible, repeal it, but you have to gain the Senate, but at least, let’s make it work for people,” Miller-Meeks said.” [The Daily Iowan, 2/27/14]
But Later In 2014, Miller-Meeks Dodged Questions About If She Supported The Bill While Continuing To Be Critical Of The Legislation, Leaving “Wiggle-Room” To Vote For Repeal If Elected

October 2014: Miller-Meeks Would Not Answer Whether She Would Have Voted To Repeal Obamacare During Debates, But Referred To The ACA As The “Unaffordable” Care Act

Miller-Meeks Would Not Answer Whether She Would Have Voted To Repeal Obamacare. “When asked directly whether she would have joined those votes to repeal Obamacare, third-time Republican nominee Dr. Mariannette Miller-Meeks tries to redirect the question. In debates and editorial board interviews, Miller-Meeks is clear that she recognizes there are beneficial aspects of the now four-year-old law, but she also favors overturning and overhauling significant sections to ensure that the law does more to increase affordability rather than just access.” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, Editorial Board, 10/28/14]

2014: Des Moines Register Editorial Board: Miller-Meeks “Is Not Shy About Expressing Contempt For The Affordable Care Act, Though She Acknowledges It Is Law.” “Miller-Meeks, however, has not made a persuasive case for why voters should remove the incumbent. Her policy positions are vague, and she hedges on a number of key issues, including offering no specifics on how to assure both Social Security and Medicare will be solvent for future retirees. She supports more spending for roads and bridges, but she says she needs more information on options for how to pay for such improvements. She also wants to see more study on climate change causes and solutions. She is not shy about expressing contempt for the Affordable Care Act, though she acknowledges it is law. And she is unflinching in criticizing President Obama for pulling U.S. troops from Iraq too soon and for a lack of clarity in dealing with terrorist threats.” [Des Moines Register, Editorial Board, 10/22/14]

Oct. 2014: Miller-Meeks Refused To Say Whether She Supported Repealing The Affordable Care Act But Referred To The ACA As The “Unaffordable” Care Act. “Loebsack, a Democrat, went after Miller-Meeks, a Republican, for not answering direct questions, specifically targeting her refusal to say whether she would repeal the Affordable Care Act. ‘I’m not clear where she is,’ he said. Miller-Meeks accused Loebsack of repeating the ‘lie of the year,’ a reference to when President Barack Obama said during the Affordable Care Act debate that people would be able to keep their insurance. As it turns out, a significant number of Americans were dropped from their health insurance plans. She criticized what she called the ‘unaffordable’ care act, but when asked, she didn’t say she would repeal it.” [The Quad-City Times, 10/12/14]

Clinton Herald: “Moderators Challenged Her Several Times To Answer Whether She Would Repeal The ACA” And Miller-Meeks Said “There Are Changes And Reform That Needs To Be Made So This Is Palatable.” “The ACA dominated the first half of the debate. Miller-Meeks criticized the bill, calling it ‘the Un-Affordable Care Act,’ and said she favors patient-centered care versus what the bill is able to offer. Moderators challenged her several times to answer whether she would repeal the ACA. ‘When you look at the totality of what happened in the health care bill, you’re seeing a partisan bill that was passed, a bad plan that was poorly executed’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘There are changes and reform that needs to be made so this is palatable, number 1, and puts patients back in the driver’s seat and preserves the doctor-patient relationship.’”[Clinton Herald, 10/11/14]

Press-Citizen Editorial: “Miller-Meeks Always Leaves Enough Wiggle-Room So… She Would Be Able To Vote For A Full-On Repeal Of Obamacare Without Having To Betray Any Campaign Promises”

Press-Citizen Editorial: “Miller-Meeks Always Leaves Enough Wiggle-Room So That, If Elected And Called Upon By The House Leadership, She Would Be Able To Vote For A Full-On Repeal Of Obamacare Without Having To Betray Any Campaign Promises.” “But in her answers, Miller-Meeks always leaves enough wiggle-room so that, if elected and called upon by the House leadership, she would be able to vote for a full-on repeal of Obamacare without having to betray any campaign promises.” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, Editorial Board, 10/28/14]
Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-01) Research Book

The Quad-City Times: Miller-Meeks Would Not Say She Would Vote To Repeal The ACA But Said “The County Needs To Transition Away From It”

Miller-Meeks Refused To Say Whether She Would Repeal ACA, Which She Favored In The Past. “Miller-Meeks mentioned the Affordable Care Act immediately in the debate as being unaffordable, she refused to say whether she’d repeal the bill. Loebsack successfully called her on that, saying she’s been for repealing it in the past and he’s not sure where she is now. She also declined to say whether nutrition assistance should be separated from the farm bill, choosing instead to talk about curing poverty.” [Des Moines Register, 8/29/14]

Miller-Meeks Said The ACA Was Forcing Companies Out Of Business And Doing Nothing To Help People Access Coverage At All

Miller-Meeks: “Affordable Care Act […] Has Not Lived Up To Expectations.” According to Miller-Meeks for Congress 2014 website under “Better Health Care Reforms”, Miller-Meeks said “We all know the so-called Affordable Care Act, also known as Obamacare, has not lived up to expectations. Iowans were promised that they could keep their doctor and insurance, while costs would go down and quality would go up. [Miller-Meeks for Congress 2014, accessed 6/15/20]
As a nurse, doctor, and former Director of the Iowa Department of Public Health, I understand this issue from all sides and want to bring that expertise to Washington to improve the health of Iowans.” [Miller-Meeks for Congress 2014, accessed 6/15/20]

**Miller-Meeks Supported Health Care Savings Accounts.** “We need reforms like health savings accounts, which give individuals more control over their health care decisions. There must be greater competition relating to costs so individuals can find the best care at the price that works for them. Finally, there must be proper insurance company oversight and transparency to make sure the patient comes first.” [Miller-Meeks for Congress 2014, accessed 6/15/20]

**Miller-Meeks Wanted To Use Her Experience As A “Medical Doctor To Hammer On What She Sees As The Evils Of Obamacare”**

**2014: Miller-Meeks Wanted To Use Her Experience As A “Medical Doctor To Hammer On What She Sees As The Evils Of Obamacare.”** “Mariannette Miller-Meeks brings name recognition to the race in her third bid as a Republican congressional nominee. She is expected to leverage her credentials as a medical doctor to hammer on what she sees as the evils of Obamacare. Her best hope is to catch a wave of voter antagonism against Obamacare and the Democrats. But the district leans Democratic, and she starts out dwarfed in the money race, with $160,000 in cash on hand.” [Des Moines Register, 6/5/14]

**Miller-Meeks: “The Affordable Care Act Is Negatively Affecting So Many Iowans From Increasing Premiums, To Canceling Insurance, To Hurting Jobs/Take-Home Pay”**

**Miller-Meeks: “The Affordable Care Act Is Negatively Affecting So Many Iowans From Increasing Premiums, To Canceling Insurance, To Hurting Jobs/Take-Home Pay.”** “Why are you running for Congress?” Mariannette Miller-Meeks: “As a doctor and 24 year veteran of the Army, I saw what was going on in our country with health care and a lack of accountability in Washington - and wanted to do something about it. The Affordable Care Act is negatively affecting so many Iowans from increasing premiums, to canceling insurance, to hurting jobs/take-home pay. I believe my experience as a doctor and former Director of the Iowa Department of Public Health gives me the credibility to implement solutions for better, patient-centered health care reforms.” [Clinton Herald, 6/2/14]

**Miller-Meeks Said The ACA Created A Barrier And Prevented Companies From Growing**

**Miller-Meeks Said The ACA Created A Barrier And Prevented Companies From Growing.** “Miller-Meeks said policies on the national level such as the Affordable Healthcare Act creates a barrier and prevents companies from growing. She said the economy in southeast Iowa is sluggish, but added policies put into place by Gov. Branstad have helped counties like Lee County and could be put into place on a federal level.” [Daily Democrat, 5/30/14]

**Miller-Meeks Stated That The Affordable Care Act Was Wreaking Havoc On Businesses And Individuals.** “Miller-Meeks, the former director of the state department of public health, said Congress had been “emasculated” by an overreaching Obama administration. And she said the Affordable Care Act is wreaking havoc on businesses and individuals. ‘You are no longer in charge of your health care,’ she said. She also complained that the government’s safety net had grown too large and trapped people. She said spending can be “reduced and restrained” while still helping people who need it.” [Muscatine Journal. 4/16/14]

**Miller-Meeks Tied The ACA To Government Intrusion That Hampers Business Growth.** “Health care is one of three basic points Miller-Meeks plans to campaign on, along with income and government accountability. She tied the ACA to government intrusion that hampers business growth, thus lowering the incomes of those who are employed.” [The Ottumwa Courier, 2/26/14]
The Hawk Eye: “Miller-Meeks Said It Was A ‘Big Oversight’ In The Law Not To Use Local People Who Already Offer Insurance Services”

In 2020, Miller-Meeks Was Critical Of The Affordable Care Act, But Did Not Mention Repeal

Miller-Meeks said people aren’t buying insurance because it was too expensive after the Affordable Care Act. In an interview with 4TR Studios on health care, Miller-Meeks was asked “Wasn’t there a sharing of the burden of insurance with some high-risk patients paying less than low-risk ones?” Miller-Meeks said “if you look at New York, where they did community rating their costs went way up when the ACA went through. So now people aren’t buying insurance because it’s too expensive. People were supposed to have a reduction in their premiums by 25% and that didn’t happen. So how do we get access while also making it affordable and how do we have choice.” [4TR Studios Health Care Interview, 00:01:45, 4/23/20] (VIDEO)

Miller-Meeks: “To Me, The Best Thing The ACA Did Was Get More People On Insurance And More Accessibility. What We Lost Was Affordability”

Miller-Meeks has been specifically critical of essential health benefits in the Affordable Care Act, which require coverage of maternity care and prescription drugs.

Miller-Meeks said she was in favor of health insurance coverage choice adding “In the ACA, some of the essential benefits are much more than what people had before so that led to increased cost.”

Miller-Meeks said she was in favor of health insurance coverage choice adding “In the ACA, some of the essential benefits are much more than what people had before so that led to increased cost.” In an interview with 4TR Studios on health care, Miller-Meeks was asked “Don’t insurance companies limit choices by determining what they will and won’t cover?” Miller-Meeks said “yes but you have an option in your plan to determine what you want so there is some benefit in that. I think if you understand the insurance industry whether it’s auto or health insurance, we don’t mandate companies cover everything to maintain your car. So they don’t cover oil changes or new tires. If we mandated them cover those things you would see the cost of your insurance go up. When you’re increasing the number of providers and increasing the benefits. You have a benefits plan instead of an insurance plan. In the ACA, some of the essential benefits are much more than what people had before so that...”
led to increased cost. So you should have a choice in determining how much coverage you need based on your age, sex, what your health status is and that is reflected in your premiums.” [4TR Studios Health Care Interview, 00:04:20 4/23/20] (VIDEO)

Miller-Meeks Said Minimum Coverage Standards Are Expansive And Argues The Requirement Takes Away Individual Choice

Miller-Meeks Said Minimum Coverage Standards Are Expansive And Argues The Requirement Takes Away Individual Choice. “An area where the two candidates differ the most over the law is its requirement that insurance policies have minimum coverage standards. Miller-Meeks says they are ‘expansive’ and argues the requirement takes away individual choice. She adds costs are being shifted to younger people, who often were uninsured or had less-robust policies than can be offered today.” [The Quad-City Times, 10/13/14]

Miller-Meeks Called The Affordable Care Act “Too Expensive” By Forcing People To Pay For Benefits They Neither Want Nor Need And The Ideal Policy For Miller-Meeks Would Not Include Maternity Or In Vitro Fertilization

Miller-Meeks Called The Affordable Care Act “Too Expensive” By Forcing People To Pay For Benefits They Neither Want Nor Need. “Dr. Mariannette Miller-Meeks said Wednesday concerns she raised two years ago about the Affordable Care Act are reality today and will bolster her bid for Congress. […] ‘Certainly, when we were discussing our concerns about the Affordable Care Act before, people could look at it and say it was hypothetical, that it was theory or it was partisanship,’ she said. Miller-Meeks said the law is ‘too expansive,’ forcing people to pay for benefits they neither need nor want. While large corporations may be able to cover the costs, she questioned whether small businesses can.” [The Ottumwa Courier, 2/26/14]

Miller-Meeks: “You Look At Me And You Can Tell I’m Not A Spring Chicken. So The Ideal Policy For Me Would Not Have Maternity, Not Have In Vitro Fertilization.” “It doesn’t have to be a one-size-fits-all policy where the government tells you what you have to have,’ she told supporters. ‘You look at me and you can tell I’m not a spring chicken. So the ideal policy for me would not have maternity, not have in vitro fertilization.”’ [The Ottumwa Courier, 2/26/14]

Before The Affordable Care Act’s Essential Benefits Coverage, Policies Routinely Did Not Cover Pregnancy Or Mental Health Care, And One In Ten Policies Did Not Cover Prescription Drugs

NPR: Before The Affordable Care Act, Insurance Companies Sold Policies That Excluded Pregnancy And Mental Health Care; 9 Percent Of Policies Didn’t Cover Prescription Drugs. “That’s because if insurance companies don’t have a list of medical services they have to include in their policies, they can sell stripped-down policies and then charge extra for specific types of coverage. This isn’t theoretical. Before the Affordable Care Act went into effect, insurance companies routinely found ways to avoid paying for expensive health care. Beyond refusing to cover people with existing medical conditions, they sold policies that excluded coverage for some medical care, including prenatal care, childbirth and mental health care. According to the Century Foundation, 9 percent of policies didn’t even cover prescription drugs.” [NPR, 3/23/17]

- Before The Affordable Care Act, 39 Percent Of Plans Did Not Cover Mental Health Care, And Those That Did Often Offered Limited Coverage. “A survey by HealthPocket Inc. shows that before Obamacare, only 61 percent of health plans included coverage for mental health care, and that coverage was often limited.” [NPR, 3/23/17]

- Before The Affordable Care Act, Only 6 Percent Of Individual Market Insurance Plans Offered Maternity Coverage, And Maternity Riders Often Had Expensive Premiums And High Deductibles. “A 2012 study by the National Women’s Law Center found that, before Obamacare, only about 6 percent of policies available on the individual insurance market included maternity coverage. One plan offered a maternity
rider that cost more than $1,600 a month on top of the regular premium. Many of those policies had maternity-specific deductibles as high as $10,000, or did not actually kick in for two years. Even insurance provided by employers had limits for maternity care. A study by Truven found that in 2010, women who had insurance through their employers still paid about $12,000 to $16,000 for childbirth.” [NPR, 3/23/17]

2009: Prior To ACA Passage, Miller-Meeks Called For Phasing Out Employer-Sponsored Health Insurance, Instead Offering Tax Credits/Deductions To Help Buy Private Individual Plans

Miller-Meeks Claimed We Should Phase Out Employer Coverage Incrementally. “We should phase out employer coverage incrementally while providing tax deductions for higher income and tax credits (pre-fund) for lower income and those with chronic pre-existing diseases. Funding such individual health plans accessed by debit cards would empower individuals, regulate the insurance industry and provide choice. We could maintain the innovative strengths of our current system, using the government to insure coverage of the needy, transparency of prices and prevention of fraud.” [Iowa City Press Citizen, 7/8/09]

Miller-Meeks Said The Government Could Gradually Phase Out The Employer Deduction. “The problem with that, Miller-Meeks admits, is that each state has different coverage requirements. So she proposes ending that practice and requiring coverage just for the three things she believes people fear most. Miller-Meeks said the government also could gradually phase out employer deduction but offer individuals the same deduction so they could choose their best means of care.” [The Hawk Eye (Burlington, Iowa), 9/6/09]

Miller-Meeks Opinion Piece Was Titled: “Left Behind In Abundance: Redesigning Our Health Care System. “Left behind in abundance: Redesigning our health care system […] I will begin by being contentious: To provide medical care to everyone, health care must be rationed. This is an indisputable economic reality. The question then becomes: Who should ration health care, a government bureaucrat or yourself? Americans have access to the best and newest technology, rapid adoption of innovation and minimal delays in obtaining state-of-the-art treatment. Yet awash in this abundance, some are economically prohibited or declined coverage for health insurance.” [Iowa City Press Citizen, 7/8/09]

Medicare & Medicaid

2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Fixing Medicare Sequestration, Saying Democrats Had Chosen “A Short-Term Fixing” And Criticizing That The Issue Had Been Tied To The Debt Limit

December 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Preventing Sequestration Cuts To Medicare And Establishing Procedures To Expedite Senate Consideration Of A Debt Limit Increase. On December 7, 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against the “Passage of the bill, as amended, that would extend from Dec. 31, 2021, to March 31, 2022, a temporary suspension of the 2 percent annual sequester of Medicare payments, and provide for payment reductions of 1 percent for the period of April 1 through June 30, 2022. As an offset, it would increase sequestration percentages above 2 percent in fiscal 2030. It would also require budget year debt for 2022 to be rolled over to the 2033 scorecards under statutory pay-as-you-go requirements, thus delaying spending cuts to Medicare and other mandatory programs subject to sequestration that would otherwise be triggered in January. It would delay a number of other Medicare payment reductions and policies, including to extend a temporary increase in payment amounts for physicians to provide a 3 percent increase for services furnished in 2022; delay for one year a provision that would phase in payment reductions for clinical diagnostic laboratory tests, prohibiting any reductions for 2021 and 2022 and prohibiting reductions greater than 15 percent for 2023 through 2025; and delay through 2022 the implementation of the Medicare radiation oncology model. It would decrease from $165 million to $101 million funding that may be expended from the Medicare Improvement Fund for fiscal 2021. Finally, the bill would establish procedures to expedite Senate consideration of a joint resolution to increase the debt limit by a specific dollar amount. Specifically, it would provide for a non-debatable motion to proceed to the joint resolution and, if the motion is agreed to, up to 10 hours of debate on the measure with no amendments or other motions in order,
immediately followed by a vote on passage. Such procedures would be valid for consideration of one joint resolution by Jan. 16, 2022.” Passed by a vote of 222-212. [S. 610, Vote 404, 12/7/21; CQ, 12/7/21]

**Miller-Meeks Said She Voted Against Fixing Medicare Sequestration Because Democrats Chose “A Short-Term Fix” And “Directly Tied It To A Debt Limit Increase.”** “Today, December 7th, 2021, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02) released the following statement after voting NO on an inadequate fix to Medicare sequestration: ‘Today, I voted no on the Democrat majority’s heavy-handed decision to play political games with Americans’ healthcare and businesses. Medicare patients need and deserve access to quality care and providers. After months of fair negotiations, the majority has chosen a short-term fix to Medicare sequestration and has directly tied it to a debt limit increase. Ensuring patients have access to care and that there are options for quality providers needs to be a top priority. Instead of kicking the can down the road, Congress should be staying in Washington until a long-term bipartisan solution is agreed upon to avoid cuts to Medicare. These political games are unacceptable and the American people deserve better. I look forward to working with my colleagues to address this issue in a permanent and constructive manner.’” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 12/7/21]


**2021: Miller-Meeks Compared Medicare Negotiating Drug Prices To The Afghanistan Withdrawal And That “If You Think That It Went Just Swimmingly, Then Of Course You Want President Biden And His Team To Negotiate Prices For You On Drugs.”** MILLER-MEEKS: “If I may, an example of that is, look at the Afghanistan withdrawal. And so, if you think that it went just swimmingly, then of course you want President Biden and his team to negotiate prices for you on drugs. If you don't think it went very well, then maybe we need to rethink how much of the government we want controlling that.” [YouTube, Kevin McCarthy, 11/5/21] (VIDEO) 00:29:15

**2021: Miller-Meeks Said Allowing The Government To Control Drug Prices Would Lead To “Rationing Of Care” Based On “How Valuable Your Life Is”**

**2021: Miller-Meeks Said Allowing The Government To Control Drug Prices Would Lead To “Rationing Of Care” Based On “How Valuable Your Life Is.”** MILLER-MEEKS: “And that is that in countries where there is government control of pricing, and there is that disparity, they also utilize your access to drugs or medications or surgery through a lens of quality-adjusted life years. And so, what this does—and think about this, if you have a child who's born with a rare disease, or a debilitating disease, or you're an individual that develops a cancer and you're at 70 years old, rather than 30 years old, the government that is going to determine your access to care by what they value your life. And so, if you're a senior citizen, the value of your life is less than if you were a young adult, and in the United States, are we ready to have—in essence, this is rationing of care. It's not, you know, it is not a scare tactic. This is precisely what will be done on the basis of how valuable your life is. And constitutionally, we know that we don't have any second-class citizens. But this sets us up to divide Americans apart into whose life is more valuable, so who gets access to treatment and who gets access to drugs, and I think it is such a discriminatory practice.” [YouTube, Kevin McCarthy, 11/5/21] (VIDEO) 00:37:46

**Dr. David Sands Op-Ed: By Opposing Allowing Medicare To Negotiate Drug Prices, Miller-Meeks Was “Hurting Iowans And People Across The Country For Strictly Political Purposes”**
Retired Physician David Sands Op-Ed: By Opposing Allowing Medicare To Negotiate Drug Prices, Miller-Meeks Was “Hurting Iowans And People Across The Country For Strictly Political Purposes.” “Dr. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, who is my representative in Congress, uses Republican talking points to justify an utterly untenable position against allowing Medicare to negotiate prices with pharmaceutical companies. I am also a physician (retired) and I have to call out Miller-Meeks for hurting Iowans and people across the country for strictly political purposes.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, David Sands, 11/22/21]

2019-2020: Miller-Meeks Voted 4 Times To Tighten Eligibility Requirements For Medicaid

2020: Miller-Meeks Voted For SF 2366, Which Tightened Eligibility Requirements For Public Programs. Miller-Meeks voted for SF 2366, “A bill for an act relating to eligibility, work, and employment and training requirements for public assistance programs, including eligibility for child care assistance and community engagement activity requirements under the Iowa health and wellness plan, and including effective date and implementation provisions.” The bill passed 31-18. [Iowa State Legislature, SF 2366, 3/3/20]

- **SF 2366 Established Work Requirements For Medicaid.** “Senate File 2366 relates to work, employment and training requirements for public assistance programs, and childcare, and does the following: Section 1 provides that unless required by federal law, the Department of Human Services (DHS) shall not seek, apply for, accept, or renew any waiver of work requirements for Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) benefits. Section 2 requires the DHS to assign individuals receiving SNAP benefits, subject to requirements established under federal law so they may participate in the Employment and Training (E&T) Program. […] Section 4 prohibits a person from being eligible for Medicaid unless the individual meets one of the work-related requirements specified in the Bill. The Bill specifies those individuals exempt from the work-related requirements.” [Iowa State Legislature, SF 2366 Fiscal Note, 3/2/20]

2020: Miller-Meeks Voted For SF 2272, Which Introduced Eligibility Verification Measures For Public Programs. Miller-Meeks voted for SF 2272, “bill for an act relating to public assistance program oversight, and including effective date provisions.” The bill passed by vote 32-17. [Iowa State Legislature, SF 2272, 2/26/20]

- **SF 2272 Introduced Eligibility Verification Measures For Medicaid And CHIP.** “Senate File 2272 requires the Department of Human Services (DHS) to implement an eligibility verification system for public assistance programs to verify the eligibility of an individual who is an applicant for any such program. […] Providing definitions used in the new Iowa Code chapter including the definition of ‘public assistance,’ which includes the Medicaid Program, the Family Investment Program (FIP), SNAP, and the Children’s Health Insurance Program (CHIP). […] Requiring that by July 1, 2021, the DHS provide for identity verification, identity authentication, asset verification, and dual enrollment prevention in each public assistance program administered by the DHS. The DHS may contract with a third-party vendor to develop a system or provide a service to verify income, assets, and identity eligibility of applicants and recipients.” [Iowa State Legislature, SF 2272 Fiscal Note, 2/25/20]

2019: Miller-Meeks Voted For Instituting “Community Engagement Activity” Eligibility Requirements For Medicaid Recipients. Miller-Meeks voted for SF 538, “A bill for an act relating to community engagement activity requirements under the Iowa health and wellness plan.” The bill passed by vote 32-17. [Iowa State Legislature, SF 538, 3/19/19]

- **SF 538 Introduced A Medicaid Eligibility Requirement Of 20 Hours Per Week Spent Working Or Volunteering.** “MEDICAID WORK REQUIREMENTS: The bill would require recipients of Medicaid — the health care program for the poor and disabled — to work or volunteer at least 20 hours per week as a condition of eligibility. Certain individuals, including someone medically certified as physically or mentally unfit for employment would be exempt from the work requirements. Senate File 538.” [Des Moines Register, 3/15/19]
2019: Miller-Meeks Voted For SF 334, A Bill Imposing New Eligibility Requirements For Public Programs. Miller-Meeks voted for SF 334, “A bill for an act relating to public assistance program oversight.” The bill passed 30-18. [Iowa State Legislature, SF 334, 4/1/19]

- **SF 334 Required Enhanced Eligibility Verification For Medicaid, SNAP, And Other State Benefits.** “Senate File 334 requires the Department of Human Services (DHS) to implement an eligibility verification system for public assistance programs to verify the eligibility of an individual who is an applicant for any such program. For the purposes of the Bill, ‘public assistance programs’ include but are not limited to the Medicaid Program, the Family Investment Program (FIP), and the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP).” [Iowa State Legislature, SF 334 Fiscal Note, 2/28/19]

- **Implementation Of SF 334 Would Have Cost Iowans More Than $24 Million Annually.** “Senate File 334 is estimated to increase annual operating costs by $15.9 million in FY 2020 and $24.4 million in FY 2021. The cost in subsequent fiscal years is estimated to be $24.6 million and will increase by 2.0% annually. This includes $15.8 million in FY 2020 and $24.1 million in FY 2021 for the DHS and $169,000 in FY 2020 and $231,000 in FY 2021 for the DIA. The increase for FY 2020 includes $3.1 million in one-time costs, with an additional $290,000 in onetime costs in FY 2021.” [Iowa State Legislature, SF 334 Fiscal Note, 2/28/19]

693,978 Iowans Relied On Medicaid For Health Care Access

693,978 Iowans Relied On Medicaid For Health Care Access. As of November 2021, 693,978 Iowans were enrolled in Medicaid. [Medicaid.gov, accessed 11/29/21]

2019: Miller-Meeks Said She Believed There May Need To Be More Oversight Of Private Businesses Controlling Funding For Disability Programs Under Privatization

2019: Miller-Meeks Said She Believed There May Need To Be More Oversight Of Private Businesses Controlling Funding For Disability Programs Under Privatization. “Another related issue is the funding for disabled programs, controlled now by a private Medicaid business deciding on the revenue stream into Iowa. Miller-Meeks believes there may need to be more oversight of the private businesses. Though she’s just started in Des Moines recently, she has already spoken with the DHS director, the Medicaid director and plans more meetings, hopefully including the MCO (businesses) that control who gets paid, when and how much. She believes the current difficulty for providers to get paid should start to be relieved as the businesses figure out what things are supposed to actually cost.” [The Daily Iowan, 2/3/19]

2018: Miller-Meeks Acknowledged Problems With The Implementation Of Medicaid Privatization In Iowa That She Said May Need To Be Worked Out Legislatively

2018: Miller-Meeks Acknowledged Problems With The Implementation Of Medicaid Privatization In Iowa That She Said May Need To Be Worked Out Legislatively. “Perhaps the biggest issue this fall is the controversial implementation of Medicaid privatization in Iowa. Critics say the process was rushed and has provided worse healthcare and higher prices, exactly the opposite of promises made by the current Republican administration. Miller-Meeks acknowledged the plan might need tweaking. ‘There was a legislative agenda and bills that were passed that said you have to pay in a timely fashion if it’s a clean claim. So, the same thing can happen in the current Medicaid program if it needs to be. As far as pre-authorization and denials of claims, again those are things that may need to be worked out thorough legislatively.’” [KTVO, 10/15/18]

2010: Miller-Meeks Said Congress Needed To Cut Spending And “Root Out Well Known And Documented Waste In Entitlement Programs Like Medicare And Medicaid”
2010: Miller-Meeks Said Congress Needed To Cut Spending And “Root Out Well Known And Documented Waste In Entitlement Programs Like Medicare And Medicaid.” According to Miller-Meeks for Congress 2010 website under “Cut Spending, Cut Government Waste”, Miller-Meeks stated “while both Republicans and Democrats are responsible for years of past budget deficits, together, we must be the solution for future generations who will inherit this massive legacy of debt. We need to enact a balanced budget amendment, afford the President line-item veto authority, cut spending and root out well known and documented waste in entitlement programs like Medicare and Medicaid which add up to tens of billions of dollars every single year.” [Miller-Meeks for Congress 2010, accessed 6/15/20]

Pre-Existing Conditions

October 2020: Miller-Meeks Said She Had Always Supported Protections For Pre-Existing Conditions, But That The ACA Had Not Made Progress On Lowering Premiums

October 2020: Miller-Meeks Said She Supported Protections For Pre-Existing Conditions But That The Affordable Care Act Had Not Brought Down The Price Of Health Care Premiums Or Allowed Choice. “Democrats have criticized Miller-Meeks for her past support of repealing the Affordable Care Act. ‘We agree that the next few years will be critical when it comes to improving Americans' health care,’ Hart campaign spokesman Riley Kilburg said in a statement. ‘Unfortunately, Mariannette Miller-Meeks supports repealing the Affordable Care Act, which would eliminate protections for those living with pre-existing conditions and coverage for essential health benefits — all while stripping more than 230,000 Iowans of their care during a pandemic. That's not the approach Iowans need.’ Miller-Meeks has said she supports protections for pre-existing conditions and would back efforts by House Republicans to continue to provide such protections and coverage for Americans, should the law be overturned by the U.S. Supreme Court. But, she has argued the ACA has failed to bring down the price of premiums and allow choice.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 10/21/20]

October 2020: Miller-Meeks Insisted She Had Always Supported Protections For Pre-Existing Conditions But That Health Care Premiums Had Gone Up And Would Continue To Rise. “Hart and national Democrats have criticized Miller-Meeks for her past support of repealing the Affordable Care Act. […] Miller-Meeks insisted she has always supported protections for pre-existing conditions; however, ‘(health care premiums) have gone up and they've continued to go up.’ ‘We need health care that is affordable, accessible, portable and still allows us to have choice,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘Employers are now looking at an average policy around $21,000 and employees' portion is around $5,500. ... We haven't made health insurance more affordable and we haven't made it portable. However, we did get more access to care. I appreciate that there was more people covered under insurance, but the other avenues ... were not addressed. Allowing people to purchase medical insurance state lines, tort reform, allowing more choice are all things that can help to lower cost.’” [Quad-City Times, 10/12/20]

September 2020: Cedar Rapids Gazette Gave An Ad’s Claim That “Miller-Meeks Supported A Plan That Would Allow Insurers To Deny Health Care Coverage Because Of Preexisting Conditions” An “A” Grade In Their Fact Check

September 2020: Women Vote! Ran An Ad Claiming “Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Who Took Thousands From Big Insurance, Supported A Plan That Could Cost 187,000 Iowans Their Coverage Or Let Insurers Deny It Because Of Preexisting Conditions, Like Diabetes.” “One of those ads is by Women Vote!, a Super PAC of Emily's List, a network formed in 1985 with the goal of electing more pro-abortion rights Democratic women to office. The 30-second ad starts by mentioning COVID-19 and showing images of damage from the Aug. 10 derecho. 'During a pandemic, in the wake of a disaster, losing your health insurance would be devastating,' the voice says. The ad claims 'Mariannette Miller-Meeks, who took thousands from big insurance, supported a plan that could cost 187,000 Iowans their coverage or let insurers deny it because of preexisting conditions, like diabetes.'” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 9/28/20]

The Cedar Rapids Gazette Fact-Check Gave The Claim “Miller-Meeks Supported A Plan That Would Allow
Insurers To Deny Health Care Coverage Because Of Preexisting Conditions” An “A” Grade. “Claim 3: The third claim is that Miller-Meeks supported a plan that would allow insurers to deny health care coverage because of preexisting conditions, including diabetes. Several Republican-proposed bills would have offered less protection for people with preexisting conditions, FactCheck.org reported in April 2019. The American Health Care Act, for example, would have required insurers to offer coverage despite preexisting conditions, but they could charge more in some cases. The House passed the legislation in 2017, but the Senate never voted on it. The House GOP bill also would have given states the option of setting their own list of essential benefits insurance companies had to cover, which could mean some services wouldn't be covered, FactCheck.org reported. Grade: A.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 9/28/20]

2010: Miller-Meeks Promised To Work For Protections For Pre-Existing Conditions Including Minimizing Price Discrimination And Guaranteeing Insurance “Renewability”

2010: Miller-Meeks Said She Would Promote “Guaranteed ‘Renewability’ And Minimize Price Discrimination For Pre-Existing Conditions.” According to Miller-Meeks for Congress 2010 website under “Reform Health Care Without a Government-Run System”, Miller-Meeks said “In Congress, I will work to: Require the government to enforce pricing transparency, fraud detection and insure that the needy are covered. Promote guaranteed ‘renewability’ and minimize price discrimination for pre-existing conditions. The former insures that if you have a catastrophic illness, the policy premium would remain level for two years. When the basic policy premium is affordable, a mandate to purchase health insurance is not required. The law that mandates emergency rooms treat patients regardless of status, would also necessarily have to be modified which would offer people further incentives to purchase highly affordable health insurance policies.” [Miller-Meeks for Congress 2010, accessed 6/15/20]

Medicare For All

2019: Miller-Meeks Said Medicare For All Was The Government “Making Decisions For You On The Most Intimate Parts Of Your Life” And Would Lead To “Limited And Reduced” Options

2019: Miller-Meeks Said Medicare For All Was The Government “Making Decisions For You On The Most Intimate Parts Of Your Life” And Would Lead To “Limited And Reduced” Options. “We know that reforming the health care system in the United States is not going to be a Medicare for all program, because it doesn’t give you choice. It’s a government bureaucrat making decisions for you on the most intimate parts of your life. And that is your healthcare choices and those of your family, or your friends or your neighbors. Medicare for all, unfortunately, may give access to people to care or to benefits, but if there’s long waiting times, if it’s out of reach, if you can’t have access to a provider close to your community, in essence you don’t have any health care at all. And if you have to go through a government bureaucrat to make the decision on what you should have for your health care and what your health care options are, we know that those options are going to be limited and reduced.” [YouTube, Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 11/14/19] (VIDEO) 00:00:45

Health Care Costs - General

2019: Miller-Meeks Said Health Care Prices Were “An Issue That Helps People Not Overutilize Health Care”

Miller-Meeks: “We Know That Price Is An Issue That Helps People Not Overutilize Health Care.” “So health care for all, the solution is to allow the marketplace to help with health care. We know that price is an issue that helps people not overutilize health care. And then there’s health, and medical care. There’s two issues at stake and looking at where healthcare is going in the future, if we don’t get a handle on health care costs now, fraud and abuse in our healthcare systems, having a Medicare for all system will end up being no medical care for anyone.” [YouTube, Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 11/14/19] (VIDEO) 00:01:27
2019: Miller-Meeks Supported Trump’s Policy That Required Hospitals To Publish Prices Of Their Services, Despite Criticism The Policy Would Drive Up Costs

June 2019: Miller-Meeks Attended The Signing Of Trump’s Healthcare Transparency Executive Order. “Honored to be part of signing of Healthcare Transparency executive order with President Trump at the White House today. More power to patients, information, choice and quality for patients with ability to lower costs!” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 6/24/19]

- Sioux City Journal: Miller-Meeks Attended Trump’s Executive Order Signing On The Improving Price and Quality Transparency in American Healthcare. “In June, Miller-Meeks, who at one time was director of the Iowa Department of Public Health, was at the White House when President Donald Trump signed an executive order on Improving Price and Quality Transparency in American Healthcare to Put Patients First. ‘Like me, Iowans are concerned about rising health care costs, premiums and drugs,’ she said in her resignation letter. ‘They have seen little progress dealing with a crisis on our southern border, despite the repeated efforts of President Donald Trump, and there does not seem to be an immediate resolution. ‘Like me, Iowans are concerned about rising health care costs, premiums and drugs,’ she said in her resignation letter.” [Sioux City Journal, 7/15/19]

- NPR: The Executive Order Required Hospitals To Publish Prices That Reflected What People Paid For Services. “‘Hospitals will be required to publish prices that reflect what people pay for services,’ said President Trump at a White House event. ‘You will get great pricing. Prices will come down by numbers that you wouldn’t believe. The cost of healthcare will go way, way down.’ Like several of President Trump’s other health policy-related announcements, today’s executive order doesn’t spell out specific actions, but directs the department of Health and Human Services to develop a policy and then undertake a lengthy rule-making process.” [NPR, 6/24/19]

- NPR: The Executive Order Did Not “Spell Out Specific Actions, But Direct[ed] The Department Of Health And Human Services To Develop A Policy And Then Undertake A Lengthy Rule-Making Process.” “‘Hospitals will be required to publish prices that reflect what people pay for services,’ said President Trump at a White House event. ‘You will get great pricing. Prices will come down by numbers that you wouldn’t believe. The cost of healthcare will go way, way down.’ Like several of President Trump’s other health policy-related announcements, today’s executive order doesn’t spell out specific actions, but directs the department of Health and Human Services to develop a policy and then undertake a lengthy rule-making process.” [NPR, 6/24/19]

- Healthcare Industry Insiders Claimed The Order Would “Have The Unintended Consequence Of Pushing Prices Up, Rather Than Down.” “Push back from various corners of the healthcare industry came quickly, with hospital and health plan lobbying organizations arguing this transparency requirement would have the unintended consequence of pushing prices up, rather than down. ‘Publicly disclosing competitively negotiated, proprietary rates will reduce competition and push prices higher — not lower — for consumers, patients, and taxpayers,’ said Matt Eyles, CEO of America’s Health Insurance Plans in a statement. He says it will perpetuate ‘the old days of the American health care system paying for volume over value. We know that is a formula for higher costs and worse care for everyone.’ Some health economists and industry observers without a vested interest expressed a similar view. Larry Levitt, senior vice president for health reform the Kaiser Family Foundation, tweeted that although the idea of greater price transparency makes sense from the perspective of consumer protection, it doesn’t guarantee lower prices. ‘I’m skeptical that disclosure of health care prices will drive prices down, and could even increase prices once hospitals and doctors know what their competitors down the street are getting paid,’ Levitt wrote.” [NPR, 6/24/19]
Miller-Meeks Did Not Say Whether She Supported A Bill Allowing Employers To Provide Only “Insurance-Like” Health Care Coverage, But Did Claim Association Health Plans Covered All 10 Of The ACA’s Essential Benefits

Miller-Meeks: “Data Shows That AHP’s Voluntarily Cover All 10 Of The ACA’s Essential Benefits, And These Plans Typically Have Broader Provider Networks Relative To The ACA Compliant Small Group And Individual Market Plans.” “Allowing small employers and self-employed individuals to join together for group coverage for health insurance purposes allows them to purchase health plans the same way large employers do. Association health plans are subject to all of the Affordable Care Act’s group health plan coverage requirements. Data shows that AHP’s voluntarily cover all 10 of the ACA’s essential benefits, and these plans typically have broader provider networks relative to the ACA compliant small group and individual market plans. In 2019, the AHP regulations were invalidated by the D.C. District Court, but a review of the decision is pending at the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals. If the circuit court overturns the district court ruling and upholds the regulations, will the Department of Labor respect that ruling and implement the regulations, or does the department plan to rescind these regulations through a new rulemaking process?” [CQ, 6/9/21]

September 2020: Miller-Meeks Refused To Give Her Stance On SF 2349, Which Allowed Employers To Offer “Insurance-Like” Health Care Coverage Without Including Protections For Pre-Existing Conditions. “In September, the National Republican Congressional Committee put out an ad hitting Hart for her support of Senate File 2349, a bill that allowed the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation to partner with Wellmark Blue Cross/Blue Shield to provide ‘insurance-like’ health care coverage for members, the Des Moines Register reported. But these policies lacked protections for preexisting conditions. Hart was one of just nine Democrats to vote for the bill. The NRCC’s commercial tells viewers to ‘cut off Rita Hart, just like she did to you.’ […] Although she was prepared to hit Hart for her support, Miller-Meeks again refused to give her stance on the bill. As her campaign did in September, Miller-Meeks declined to answer about her support of these ‘insurance-like’ coverage options.” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 9/28/20]

Stem Cell Research

Miller-Meeks Supported Stem Cell Research Advances But Opposed Measures That “Allows Life To Be Created Only To Have It Destroyed”

2010: Miller-Meeks Said She “Not In Favor Of Any Measure That Allows Life To Be Created Only To Have It Destroyed” But Was Supportive Of The Medical Advances In Stem Cell Research. According to Miller-Meeks for Congress 2010 website under “Traditional Iowa Values”, Miller-Meeks wrote “On the issue of stem cell research, I am not in favor of any measure that allows life to be created only to have it destroyed. As a doctor, I am however encouraged and supportive of the medical advances in stem cell research that could bring about life-saving medicines for some of the world’s most crippling diseases.” [Miller-Meeks for Congress 2010, accessed 6/15/20]

Medical Lawsuits

2010: Miller-Meeks Said She Wanted To “Save $60 Billion Over 10 Years By Capping Rewards Derived From Medical Lawsuits”

2010: Miller-Meeks Said She Wanted To “Save $60 Billion Over 10 Years By Capping Rewards Derived From Medical Lawsuits.” According to Miller-Meeks for Congress 2010 website under “Reform Health Care Without a Government-Run System”, Miller-Meeks said “Save $60 billion over 10 years by capping rewards derived from medical lawsuits. Medical liability reform will reduce defensive medicine, which right now forces doctors to produce unnecessary tests, procedures and medications to cover themselves in the event of a lawsuit. Enhance medical record technology to reduce medical errors.” [Miller-Meeks for Congress 2010, accessed 6/15/20]
Prenatal Health Care

2019: Miller-Meeks Said Increasing Prenatal Care For “Legal Permanent Residents” Led To Better Outcomes For Children And Parents, And Resulted In State Cost-Saving Within Medicaid

2019: Miller-Meeks Said Increasing Prenatal Care For “Legal Permanent Residents” Led To Better Outcomes For Children And Parents, And Resulted In State Cost-Saving Within Medicaid. “We also make better access to oral contraceptives for women, so that if they were already on oral contraceptives, they wouldn’t need to go to the pharmacy every month to get their oral contraceptive medication refilled. We also make access to legal permanent residents having access to prenatal care. We know that this was an issue within our state. And I was spoken to by many providers who were trying to address this issue, because among this population of legal residents to the United States, there was higher rates of premature infant birth and admission to the neonatal intensive care unit. Because Medicaid already pays for these deliveries and these bursts, this was something that was costing our state millions of dollars. To be able to have access to prenatal care for these legal permanent residents would allow us to have healthier babies, healthier moms, pro-legal immigration, pro-family, and ultimately save costs within our Medicaid system within our state and I was proud to be able to sponsor that legislation.” [YouTube, Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 11/14/19] (VIDEO) 00:03:57

Telehealth

Miller-Meeks Said Expanding Rural Health Care Was One Of Her Top Priorities And That There Was A Need To Boost Access To And Insurance Coverage Of Telehealth

Miller-Meeks: “Expanding Health Care Services In Rural America And Among Our Veterans Are Two Of My Top Priorities In Congress.” “All four of Iowa’s U.S. House members are supporting the ‘Sgt. Ketchum Rural Veterans' Mental Health Act,’ which was discussed in a hearing Thursday. The bill's title honors Ketchum, a Davenport veteran who died by suicide in 2016 after being denied inpatient psychiatric care at the Iowa City Veterans Administration Medical Center. […] U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, a Republican who represents southeast Iowa and who is an Air Force veteran, joined the call for the proposal. ‘Expanding health care services in rural America and among our veterans are two of my top priorities in Congress, so I am proud to join the entire Iowa delegation in this effort. We simply have to do better for our veterans, there is no other option,’ Miller-Meeks wrote in this week's joint news release about the bill.” [Des Moines Register, 4/16/21]

October 2020: Miller-Meeks Said There Was A Need To Boost Access To Telehealth And Strengthen Insurance Coverage For Virtual Health Care. “Miller-Meeks said the Aug. 10 derecho particularly showed a need to look at Iowa’s electric infrastructure and grids to better handle another natural disaster. She also said there is a need to boost access to telehealth and strengthen insurance coverage for virtual health care, as well as to increase access to rural broadband to support virtual learning, health care and work.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 10/8/20]

Mental Health

2019: Miller-Meeks Said She Worked To Pass A Bill That Set Up A Children’s Mental Health System In Iowa

2019: Miller-Meeks Said She Worked To Pass A Bill That Set Up A Children’s Mental Health System In Iowa. “While the Democratic nomination process has been quiet, the Republican nomination is hotly contested between Miller-Meeks and LeClaire businessman Bobby Schilling. In a statement about Reynolds endorsement, Miller-Meeks said her legislative record ‘championed’ Reynolds’ priorities in the 2019 session. She referenced the passage of a bill that banned most abortions after a fetal heartbeat was detected which was struck down in January 2019. She also mentioned her work to pass a bill that set up a children’s mental health system in Iowa and a pro-
gun rights resolution aiming to add a 2nd Amendment protections to the Iowa Constitution.” [Iowa City Press-Citizen. 11/8/19]

- The Bill Laid The Groundwork For Iowa’s First Comprehensive Mental Health System For Children. “Gov. Kim Reynolds has signed a law (HF690) laying the groundwork for the state’s first comprehensive mental health system for children. It initially requires the state’s mental health regions to determine how to fix gaps in existing programs, although they won’t receive extra money this year to make changes. The law requires that a set of core services be made available across the state, ranging from assessment and medication management to crisis response and inpatient treatment. It also establishes a board to oversee the system, advise the regions and help coordinate community services.” [Iowa Public Radio 5/1/19]

**Opioids**

**2021: Miller-Meeks Co-Sponsored A Bill To Authorize A Pilot Program Addressing Opioid Overdose Deaths In Rural Areas**

May 2021: Miller-Meeks Co-sponsored A Bill To Authorize A DOJ Pilot Program To Fund Programs In Rural Areas Focusing On Reducing Opioid Overdose Deaths. “Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02), joined Reps. Connor Lamb (PA-17), Randy Feenstra (IA-04), and Abigail Spanberger (VA-07) introducing the Rural Area Opioid Prevention Pilot Program Act. This bipartisan legislation will fully authorize the U.S. Department of Justice’s (DOJ) pilot program, the Rural Responses to the Opioid Epidemic Initiative, providing the agency with the resources it needs to implement community response programs in rural areas with a focus on reducing opioid overdose deaths and providing alternatives to incarceration. ‘Rural America has been hit hard by the opioid epidemic for years, and Iowa is no exception. The COVID-19 pandemic only made things worse, and we need to be doing more to help those fighting addiction,’ said Miller-Meeks. ‘The Rural Area Opioid Prevention Pilot Program Act is a step in the right direction to help rural communities combat this crisis. Helping Americans take on opioid abuse and addiction is a bipartisan issue, and I am proud to partner with my colleagues to find solutions to this problem.’” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 5/4/21]

**2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Blocking Consideration Of H.R. 2430, The Temporary Reauthorization And Study Of The Emergency Scheduling Of Fentanyl Analogues Act.**

2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Blocking Consideration Of H.R. 2430, The Temporary Reauthorization And Study Of The Emergency Scheduling Of Fentanyl Analogues Act. In April 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against: “DeSaulnier, D-Calif., motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and possibility of amendment).” According to the Congressional Record, “Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, Republicans will amend the rule immediately to consider H.R. 2430, the Temporary Reauthorization and Study of the Emergency Scheduling of Fentanyl Analogues Act. This critical bill would extend the Drug Enforcement Administration's authority to temporarily schedule fentanyl analogues for another year.” A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of the bill. The motion was agreed to by a vote of 217-208. [H Res 303, Vote #102, 4/14/21; CQ, 4/14/21; Congressional Record, 4/14/21]

**Smoking**

**2019: Miller-Meeks Said She Helped Put Forward The Legislation Mandating Medicaid Coverage Of Chantix, A Smoking Cessation Medication, That Eventually Led To Its Coverage**

2019: Miller-Meeks Said She Helped Put Forward The Legislation Mandating Medicaid Coverage Of Chantix, A Smoking Cessation Medication, That Eventually Led To Its Coverage. “Because health care is an important issue to me, I had the opportunity as a state senator to be able to directly impact people. We put forward
legislation that would in the preauthorization for people on Medicaid to get Chantix to stop smoking. As that legislation was going through, Medicaid director decided that we didn’t need to pursue the legislation and he sent out a memorandum that it would no longer be required.” [YouTube, Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 11/14/19] (VIDEO) 00:03:32
Housing Issues

**Significant Findings**

- Miller-Meeks said that a lack of affordable housing was a barrier to bringing in new workers and keeping young people in Iowa.
- Miller-Meeks called the COVID-19 eviction moratorium “unconstitutional.”
  - Miller-Meeks said pandemic evictions were “only affecting a very small percentage of people.”
  - Miller-Meeks said the eviction moratorium hurts small businesses, local community banks, and landlords who “can’t pay their property taxes because they’ve got no income.”
- Miller-Meeks said regulations were increasing the cost of building houses by 25%.
- In 2008, Miller-Meeks said “our housing policy put people into homes they couldn’t afford” and she would like to see the federal reserve stop lowering interest rates.

**COVID-19 Eviction Moratorium**

**Miller-Meeks Called The Eviction Moratorium “Unconstitutional” And Said It Was “Unfairly Harming Mom & Pop Property Owners.”** “Props on your coverage of this horrendous execution. Meanwhile, POTUS extends an unconstitutional eviction moratorium unfairly harming mom & pop property owners who have problems paying mortgage, property taxes and upkeep.” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 8/14/21]

**At A House Oversight Hearing On Pandemic Evictions, Miller-Meeks Said They Were “Spending Our Time In A Committee” Discussing An Issue That Was “Only Affecting A Very Small Percentage Of People” Instead Of Discussing The Origins Of COVID-19.** “JAMES CLYBURN: One good morning. The House Committee will come to order. Without objection, the Chair is authorized to declare a recess of the committee at any time. I now recognize myself for an opening statement. We are here today to discuss an issue of the utmost importance, ensuring that the coronavirus pandemic, which has already resulted in a loss of life for more than 600,000 Americans, does not result in the loss of stable homes for millions more. […] MARIANNETTE MILLER-MEEKS: So essentially what I'm hearing as I'm here is, we're spending our time in a committee, discussing an issue that, while it's very important, is only affecting a very small percentage of people, and for which policies have been put in place, that may be more constitutionally based and essential, that we don't have the data to tell us how many displacements. Meanwhile, in a committee that's addressing the select coronavirus task force, we still don't know the origins of COVID-19. And we have had Representatives here suggest that the origins of COVID-19 investigation would be brought up in another committee, and it's important for public health, national security, and also for how our media treats information and where it comes from, that we know the origins of COVID-19, which we still don't have.” [CQ, 7/27/21]

**Miller-Meeks Said The Eviction Moratorium Hurts Small Businesses, Local Community Banks, And Landlords Who “Can’t Pay Their Property Taxes Because They’ve Got No Income.”** “So remember that it was the moderate Democrats who kept the progressives from being able to have an extension of the eviction moratorium. Maxine Waters and other progressive Democrats were really pushing for that issue but as we know that’s an issue that hurts mom-and-pops, it hurts our local community banks, it hurts our tax base, when the person who as a landowner, property owner, who rents out just a simple property can’t pay their property taxes because they’ve got no income.” [FOX Business, 8/21/21] (VIDEO) 00:00:42-00:01:12
Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-01) Research Book

Housing Costs & Affordability

Miller-Meeks: “We Continually Hear That Housing Is An Issue To Bring In New Workers.” “On a sunny Wednesday morning, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (R-IA) made a visit to Pella for a National Home Builders Association Field Tour. She traveled with Congressman Dan Newhouse (R-WA) and Congressman Bill Johnson (R-Ohio), as well as American Farm Bureau President Zippy Duvall. The visit was a part of a tour where the Representatives speak out against the Biden Administration’s recent decision to rescind the 2020 Navigable Waters Protection Rule. All three are members of the Congressional Western Caucus, and they’ve been publicly vocal about keeping the Navigable Waters Protection Rule. The elected officials had the opportunity to take a tour around a home under construction while speaking with stakeholders on issues related to housing. For Miller-Meeks, she said one of the most notable outcomes of the pandemic is it reinforced how communities can work together while living in small, rural areas. According to the Des Moines Register, the population of Pella has increased by 1 percent. While more people live in the area, Miller-Meeks said it’s important for workers to have access towards more affordable homes. ‘We continually hear that housing is an issue to bring in new workers,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘You can't expand your business if you don't have a workforce of people to fill those jobs.’” [Oskaloosa Herald, 8/18/21]

Miller-Meeks Said Affordable Housing Would Help Keep Younger People In Iowa. “Besides attracting more employers, Miller-Meeks said more affordable housing in Pella will help keep younger people in Iowa. ‘We want people to come here, we wouldn't be able to track the population of our state and we wouldn't be able to keep the young people that are here,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘They're not going to do that if they can't find a house that is suitable for them within the boundaries of what they’re looking for.’” [Oskaloosa Herald, 8/18/21]

November 2021: Miller-Meeks Shared An Article About Consumer Prices That Cited “Surging Costs” For Housing. “Prices for U.S. consumers jumped 6.2% in October compared with a year earlier as surging costs for food, gas and housing left Americans grappling with the highest inflation rate since 1990.”” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 11/10/21]

2008 Foreclosure Crisis

2008: Miller-Meeks Said “Lower Interest Rates And Our Housing Policy Put People Into Homes They Couldn’t Afford.” “What else needs to happen is to strengthen the dollar against other currencies. ‘We need to admit that lower interest rates and our housing policy put people with shaky credit into homes they couldn’t afford,’ she said. ‘We should help those who were misled.’ She said the lending companies may have to face the loss. She would like to see the Federal Reserve stop lowering interest rates and perhaps even increase them slightly. People are becoming distrustful of loans, Miller-Meeks said, and that is not good for business.” [Daily Democrat, 5/1/08]

Regulation

Miller-Meeks: “Regulation Is Increasing The Cost Of Building Houses For Our Workforce By About 25%” And “May Not Improve Safety Or Quality.” “Regulation is increasing the cost of building houses for our workforce by about 25%. And every community we visit, every employer that we talk to, housing is one of the issues that is keeping them from attracting people to work, from increasing their workforce or increasing the products and expanding their business. So when you learn that regulation which may not improve safety or quality is costing 25% more to build a house so that an average income, middle, lower income family could afford, it tells me there is work that we have to do in Capitol Hill, working with our states in order to reduce that regulation. Make sure that we can have safety and that we can have quality, but if we want affordable housing and we want to expand our workforce, and especially here in rural Iowa, then we need to look at regulatory end of that. And one of those things is the Navigable Waters Protection Rule.” [KNIA-KRLS Radio, 8/19/21] (AUDIO) 00:00:17-00:01:19

Miller-Meeks Said That Changing Regulations Was Necessary To Affordable Housing And Workforce Expansion In Iowa. “Regulation is increasing the cost of building houses for our workforce by about 25%. And
every community we visit, every employer that we talk to, housing is one of the issues that is keeping them from attracting people to work, from increasing their workforce or increasing the products and expanding their business. So when you learn that regulation which may not improve safety or quality is costing 25% more to build a house so that an average income, middle, lower income family could afford, it tells me there is work that we have to do in Capitol Hill, working with our states in order to reduce that regulation. Make sure that we can have safety and that we can have quality, but if we want affordable housing and we want to expand our workforce, and especially here in rural Iowa, then we need to look at regulatory end of that. And one of those things is the Navigable Waters Protection Rule.” [KNIA-KRLS Radio, 8/19/21] (AUDIO) 00:00:17-00:01:19

Miller-Meeks Suggested Consideration Of State Regulations As Criteria For Federal Housing Grants.
“HOST: What’s the process? What's the next step so that this visit actually means something? MILLER-MEEKS: Well one is that we have a resolution for the Navigable Waters Protection Rule, to keep it in place. The information that we have now, we take that back, we can do oversight, we can do hearings. This affects Labor, which I’m on, it affects Energy and Commerce Committee, Appropriations Committee, so when we’re having communities asking for federal money for housing, one of the things we can look at is with that money, what regulations are tied to it? What regulations within the state are making it more difficult? So you can package those things together.” [KNIA-KRLS Radio, 8/19/21] (AUDIO) 00:04:50-00:05:35
## Immigration & Border Issues

### Significant Findings

- Miller-Meeks claimed the “border was controlled prior to Jan 21, 2021” and claimed Trump’s immigration policies “were working and should have been kept in place.”

  - However, in 2019 Miller-Meeks said there had been “little progress dealing with a crisis on our southern border, despite the repeated efforts of President Donald Trump.”

- Miller-Meeks voted against terminating Trump-era rules restricting access into the US from certain Muslim-majority countries.

- March 2021: Miller-Meeks sponsored the REACT Act, a bill requiring migrants in DHS custody to test negative for COVID-19 before release or placement.

  - Miller-Meeks said testing on the southern border was “one of the many keys” to controlling COVID-19, questioning why “land travelers” were not subject to the same requirements as those flying.

- Miller-Meeks voted against blocking consideration of the PAUSE Act, which would prohibit the weakening of Title 42 public health restrictions preventing asylum seekers from entering the U.S. during the pandemic.

- Miller-Meeks said loosening border control under Biden led to “an unparalleled surge” of COVID-19 and risked “bringing north the lambda variant as Texas Democrats brought north the delta variant.”

- Miller-Meeks supported the border wall and said under Biden the United States was “still paying for [border wall] construction that’s not going on.”

- March 2021: Miller-Meeks voted against the Dream Act providing residency status for undocumented immigrants who entered the US as children or from TPS-designated nation.

  - March 2021: Miller-Meeks complained “one of the issues with DACA in my view was that it was through executive order, not through legislation.”

- Oskaloosa Herald: Miller-Meeks said she thought it was “unfair to allow illegal immigrants to enter U.S. grounds immediately” while those pursuing legal processes of entry waited years and claimed to believe legal immigration should be “faster and easier.”

### Miller-Meeks Touted The Trump Administration’s Border Efforts Throughout 2021 In Criticism Of Biden’s Approach…

#### September 2021: Miller-Meeks Claimed The “Border Was Controlled Prior To Jan 21, 2021” And Called For A Full Return To Trump-Era Policies

Miller-Meeks Claimed The “Border Was Controlled Prior To Jan 21, 2021.” “Border was controlled prior to Jan 21, 2021” QUOTE TWEET @SenJoniErnst: “A humanitarian crisis & national security crisis are continuing to unfold at our southern border. What is the Biden Administration doing about it? #BidenBorderCrisis.” [Twitter,
Miller-Meeks: “We Need To Build The Wall” And “Put Back In Place Those Policies That Trump Put In Place.” MILLER-MEEKS: “Every country has the right to secure its borders. We’re a sovereign nation. It is important. We need to build the wall. We need to get a handle on immigration. And we need to put back in place those policies that Trump put in place.” [YouTube, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 9/29/21] (VIDEO) 00:03:16

June 2021: Miller-Meeks Said Trump’s Immigration Policies “Were Working And Should Have Been Kept In Place”

Miller-Meeks: Trump’s Immigration Policies “Were Working And Should Have Been Kept In Place.” “CBP agents told us policies of prior administration were working and should have been kept in place. We lack border security now.” QUOTE TWEET @GOPLeader: “President Biden says that he inherited an insecure border—that is FALSE. Our border is facing a health, humanitarian, and national security crisis like none we have ever witnessed—and it is a direct result of the disastrous policies of President Biden and VP Harris.” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 6/27/21]

April 2021: Miller-Meeks Said The Border Was A Crisis Because of The Biden Administration, Whereas “We Were Able To Have Some Orderly Process Under The Trump Administration”

Miller-Meeks Said The Immigration And Border Policies Of The Trump Administration Had Been Working Prior To Revision By Biden. “This border crisis is disorder at the border from the executive orders of the current administration and needs to be addressed,’ she said. ‘So, our border patrol is working diligently in a humanitarian way to be able to treat unaccompanied minors, to be able to treat families’ and stem what she said has become a ‘humanitarian crisis.’ ‘So we do need to address this, and we need to address this in a bipartisan way working with the current administration to put a stop to the surge that is happening now’ as a result of getting rid of the policies of the former administration, ‘which were working,’ Miller-Meeks said.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 3/16/21]

April 2021: Miller-Meeks Said Border Patrol Agents Had Told Her That Ending Trump-Era Policies “Created This Surge” Of Immigration.

“HOST: I wonder, under the Trump administration, a number of mechanisms and systems that previously handled influxes of migrants, for instance, the asylum system, the Central American Minors Program which reunites children from Central American countries with legal guardians or parents here in the states. You know, they were dismantled. And I wonder, as you watch this now, do you believe it was a mistake to dismantle those systems? MILLER-MEEKS: Yes, that’s a great question. I can tell you that the border patrol agents that we met with, all of them were very supportive of the previous administration’s policies, and they think ending them has created this surge. They also told us that at midnight, these were their words, at midnight on January 20th, the wall stopped being built, including that portion of the wall that was already funded. So they have gaps, a 17-mile gap, and that with that new wall was also technology and all of that has stopped. They’re very supportive of the wall. The technology that went with the wall, so that was video sensors, that was sensors to detect motion and also underground sensors that would detect tremors. All of those things were extraordinarily important.” [CNN Newsroom via YouTube, 3/16/21] (VIDEO)

…But In 2019, Miller-Meeks Said There Had Been “Little Progress Dealing With A Crisis On Our Southern Border”
Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-01) Research Book

Miller-Meeks Said There Had Been “Little Progress Dealing With A Crisis On Our Southern Border, Despite The Repeated Efforts Of President Donald Trump.” “Like me, Iowans are concerned about rising health care costs, premiums and drugs,’ she said in her resignation letter. ‘They have seen little progress dealing with a crisis on our southern border, despite the repeated efforts of President Donald Trump, and there does not seem to be an immediate resolution.” [The Gazette, 7/15/19]

**Muslim Ban**

**Miller-Meeks Voted Against The NO BAN Act, Terminating Trump-Era Rules Restricting Access Into The US From Certain Muslim-Majority Countries**

Miller-Meeks Voted Against The NO BAN Act, Prohibiting The President From Banning Individuals Seeking Immigrant Visas Based On Their Religion. In April 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against: “Passage of the bill that would explicitly prohibit discrimination based on religion with regard to individuals seeking immigrant visas, nonimmigrant visas or other entry into the United States. It would limit the president’s ability to restrict entry of a class of foreign nationals, including to require that such restrictions be temporary, narrowly tailored and subject to a State Department determination that they are in the interest of U.S. public safety or international stability. It would require the State and Homeland Security departments to notify Congress prior to the issuance of any such restriction and provide information regarding its justification and planned duration; brief Congress within 48 hours of its issuance; and report Congress every 30 days during the restriction on its continued justification and how visa applicants are impacted. It would terminate the restriction, absent intervening congressional action, if the briefing or reports are not provided. The bill would allow individuals present in the United States who are harmed by entry restrictions in violation of the bill’s provisions to seek declaratory or injunctive relief through a U.S. district court. It would also require the State and Homeland Security departments to submit a report to Congress describing the implementation of proclamations by former President Donald Trump that restricted the entry of individuals from certain countries, including the number of refugees admitted and the number of visa applicants admitted or rejected, disaggregated by country and visa category.” The bill passed 218 to 208. [HR 1333, Vote #127, 4/21/21; CQ, 4/21/21]

- **The No Ban Act Would Vacate Trump’s Existing Travel Bans On Countries His Administration Deemed To Be Threats To National Security And Put Measures In Place To Prevent Similar Bans In The Future.** “The No Ban Act would vacate Trump’s existing travel bans on countries his administration deems to be threats to national security, as well as put in place measures to prevent future such bans. Under the first version of Trump’s travel ban, unveiled in January 2017, citizens of seven major Muslim countries, including those who held US green cards and dual US citizenship, were held for questioning for many hours at airports across the country and were denied entry to the US. A de facto ‘Muslim ban,’ the policy appeared to be the execution of Trump’s call on the campaign trail for a ‘total and complete shutdown’ of Muslims entering the US and sparked widespread protests throughout the country. […] The No Ban Act would dial back the president’s authority to issue such bans under the Immigration and Nationality Act, which was ‘not intended to provide carte blanche authority to the president to ban large categories of individuals without justification, or to rewrite immigration laws with which he disagrees,’ Chair Jerrold Nadler said on the House floor Wednesday.” [Vox, 7/22/20]

- **The No Ban Act Would Amend Current Law To Require That Any Travel Ban Be Temporary, Based On Credible Evidence, Subject To Congressional Oversight, And Be Created Only In Response To Specific Actions Foreign Entities Have Taken To Threaten The U.S.** “The No Ban Act would amend the current law to require that any travel ban be temporary, based on credible evidence, subject to congressional oversight, and be created only in response to specific actions foreign entities have taken to threaten the US. The bill also states that a ban must also advance a compelling government interest in the least restrictive way possible.” [Vox, 7/22/20]
March 2021: Miller-Meeks Sponsored The REACT Act, A Bill Requiring Migrants Held By DHS To Test Negative For COVID-19 Before Release Or Placement

March 2021: Miller-Meeks Sponsored The REACT Act, A Bill Requiring Migrants Held By DHS To Test Negative For COVID-19 Before Release Or Placement. On March 16, 2021, Miller-Meeks sponsored HR 1897, the REACT Act, which “requires the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to administer a COVID-19 (i.e., coronavirus disease 2019) test and receive a negative result before releasing an alien in certain instances. Specifically, DHS must receive a negative test result before an inadmissible alien may be released from custody or placed in an alternative to detention program, if that release or placement takes place within 30 days of that alien’s entry into the United States.” The bill was read twice and referred to House Judiciary. [HR 1897, Sponsored, 3/16/21; CQ, 3/16/21]

Miller-Meeks Said Testing On The Southern Border Was “One Of The Many Keys” To Controlling COVID-19, Questioned Why “Land Travelers” Were Not Subject To The Same Requirements As Those Flying

Miller-Meeks Said Private Business Employees Were Mandated To Get Vaccinated Yet Those Who Cross The Southern Border Were Not Required To Be Tested Or Vaccinated. (1:12) MILLER-MEEKS: “Well it’s hypocritical on several fronts. One is if you fly into this country you have to be COVID 19 tested, but you can’t get on a plane and fly into the United States with out being COVID 19 tested. Number two you have immigrants, migrants, refugees from Afghanistan coming here. They are not only COVID 19 tested they are offered the vaccination and offered any other childhood vaccinations that they may be lacking or need. Being tested and vaccinated. And then you have a mandate in the United States that everyone gets vaccinated whether you’re in a private employee, private business employee or you’re in the government. Yet you can come across the southern border, not be tested, not be vaccinated. [Fox Business, 9/29/21] (VIDEO)

- Miller-Meeks Said It Was Hypocritical That Those Who Fly To The US, And Afghan Migrants And Refugees Were COVID Tested But Those Who Cross The Southern Border Were Not Required To Be Tested Or Vaccinated. (1:12) MILLER-MEEKS: “Well it’s hypocritical on several fronts. One is if you fly into this country you have to be COVID 19 tested, but you can’t get on a plane and fly into the United States with out being COVID 19 tested. Number two you have immigrants, migrants, refugees from Afghanistan coming here. They are not only COVID 19 tested they are offered the vaccination and offered any other childhood vaccinations that they may be lacking or need. Being tested and vaccinated. And then you have a mandate in the United States that everyone gets vaccinated whether you’re in a private employee, private business employee or you’re in the government. Yet you can come across the southern border, not be tested, not be vaccinated. [Fox Business, 9/29/21] (VIDEO)

Miller-Meeks: “If We’re Requiring Air Travelers To Have A Negative COVID-19 Test Before Entry, Why Aren’t We Requiring The Same Of Land Travelers?” “MARIANNETTE MILLER-MEEKS: If we’re requiring air travelers to have a negative COVID-19 test before entry, why aren’t we requiring the same of land travelers? If we are able to test Afghan people for COVID and vaccinate them not only for COVID but measles, mumps, rubella, and polio, and other age-appropriate vaccinations, which are required by the CDC, why is there a double standard among our southwest border? Do you agree with the IG’s report? And the DHS did concur with two recommendations in that report, I believe. Do you agree that it’s your responsibility to ensure that there are strong protocols at the border to mitigate the spread of COVID-19? Do you commit to implementing the IG’s recommendations and identify ways to mitigate the spread of COVID-19? And do you commit to report back to this committee within a month on the progress the department has made at the border on testing for COVID-19? Thank you.” [CQ, 9/22/21]

Miller-Meeks: “Testing Of People Coming Across Our Southern Border Is One Of The Many Keys To Controlling The Spread Of COVID-19.” “MARIANNETTE MILLER-MEEKS: According to CBP officials, as a frontline law enforcement agency, it does not have the necessary resources to conduct such testing. I don’t have to
tell you that we’re in a pandemic, Mr. Secretary, and I believe that testing of people coming across our southern border is one of the many keys to controlling the spread of COVID-19. That is why back in March, I introduced my first bill, the REACT Act to require COVID-19 testing for all migrants.” [CQ, 9/22/21]

**Miller-Meeks Pushed Dr. Fauci To Require COVID-19 Testing For Everyone Crossing The Border And Claimed Ten Percent Of People Trying To Get Into The Country Were Infected With COVID-19.** “Second District Congresswoman Mariannette Miller-Meeks has been given some unique opportunities for a freshman in Congress. Recently she questioned Dr. Anthony Fauci on the United States’ response to the coronavirus. As a doctor in Congress, she was asked to be on the Select Subcommittee on the Coronavirus Crisis, a platform where she questioned Fauci on COVID-19 and immigration. She pushed Fauci to require COVID-19 testing for everybody coming across the border. She said she has seen figures that 10 percent of those trying to get into the country are infected with the virus.” [Southeast Iowa Union, 5/10/21]

**Miller-Meeks Said That Migrants Were Not Being Tested For COVID-19 At Migrant Processing Facilities**

**Miller-Meeks: Biden Was Not Requiring COVID Vaccination Or Testing For Migrants That He Was “Assisting Come Across Illegally And For Which Taxpayers Are Footing The Bill To Temporarily House And Transport.”** “But not those he is assisting come across illegally and for which taxpayers are footing the bill to temporarily house and transport. No COVID testing or vaccination required. Meanwhile over 100,000 green cards may be ‘wasted’.” QUOTE TWEET @AP: “The Biden administration plans to require nearly all foreign visitors traveling to the U.S. to be vaccinated for the coronavirus, a White House official says.” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 8/4/21]

**Miller-Meeks Said That Migrants Were Not Being Tested For COVID-19 At Migrant Processing Facilities.** “Well, we first went into a processing facility. […] So, they saw the biggest number of both unaccompanied minors, families and then single adults coming across the border. And those are just the ones that they know that came through the facility. They processed them outdoors because of COVID-19, but they’re not tested for COVID-19. They have, you know, facilities for them to sleep. They provide food, clothing, diapers. They have a screening questionnaire for medical and temperature checks, but other than that, they’re not testing for COVID-19.” [CNN Newsroom via YouTube, 3/16/21] (VIDEO)

**Miller-Meeks Voted Against Blocking Consideration Of The PAUSE Act, Which Would Prohibit The Weakening Of Title 42 Public Health Restrictions Barring Asylum Seekers From Entry During The Pandemic**

**July 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Blocking Consideration Of A Bill Providing For Stringent Enforcement Of A Public Health Order Allowing Rapid Deportations.** In July 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against: “Morelle, D-N.Y., motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and possibility of amendment).” According to the Congressional Record, Rep. Reschenthaler said, “Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. The Biden administration has extended border shutdowns with Mexico and Canada, extended European and other international travel restrictions, and has reimposed mask mandates for fully vaccinated people, contradicting previous CDC guidance and, sadly, choosing to follow the political science, not the science. But, Mr. Speaker, the chaos at our southern border, where illegal immigrants have been apprehended from over 160 countries, undermines any efforts to prevent the spread of COVID-19. That is why, if we defeat the previous question, I will personally offer an amendment to the rule to immediately consider Congresswoman Yvette Herrell’s PAUSE Act of 2021. This legislation would provide for stringent enforcement of Title 42, a public health order allowing illegal immigrants to be quickly expelled from the United States, and would prohibit HHS and DHS from weakening Title 42’s implementation.” A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of the bill. The motion was agreed to by a vote of 217-208. [H Res 567, Vote #232, 7/28/21; CQ, 7/28/21; Congressional Record, 7/28/21]
June 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Blocking Consideration Of The PAUSE Act, Which Would Prohibit The Weakening Of Title 42 Public Health Restrictions On Admitting Asylum Seekers To The United States. In June 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against “provide for floor consideration of the IG Independence and Empowerment Act (HR 2662); a bill (HR 3005) to remove the bust of former Supreme Court Chief Justice Taney and Confederate statues from the U.S. Capitol; a resolution (H Res 503) to establish a special committee to investigate the Jan. 6 attack on the U.S. Capitol; and a five-year surface transportation and ten-year water infrastructure authorization bill (HR 3684).” According to the Congressional Record, Rep. Guy Reschenthaler stated: “That is why, if we defeat the previous question, I will personally offer an amendment to the rule to immediately consider my good friend’s, Congresswoman Yvette Herrell, PAUSE Act. The PAUSE Act would provide for stringent enforcement of Title 42, and would prohibit HHS and DHS from weakening Title 42’s implementation.” A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of these four bills. The motion was agreed to 214-195. [H. Res. 504, Vote #189, 6/29/21; CQ, 6/29/21; Congressional Record, 6/29/21]


Miller-Meeks Said Loosening Border Requirements Had Led To “An Unparalleled Surge” Of COVID-19 And Risked “Bringing North The Lambda Variant Just As The Texas House Democrats Brought North The Delta Variant.” MILLER-MEEKS: “Yet while this administration is considering more COVID restrictions for American citizens on one hand, it is planning to loosen restrictions on migrants at the border on the other. This has opened our borders to an unparalleled surge that is not diminishing and is also risking bringing north the lambda variant just as the Texas house Democrats brought north the Delta variant.” [YouTube, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 7/28/21] (VIDEO) 00:01:55

Miller-Meeks Said The Migrant Processing Facilities She Visited Were Drastically Over Capacity

Miller-Meeks Said Donna Processing Facility For Migrants Was At 420% Capacity When She Visited. “MILLER-MEEKS: I was at the border earlier this week in the Rio Grande Valley sector and–and thank you, Representative Waters for bringing up congregating in the elevators and crowding. Because when I was there at the Donna Processing Facility, that facility was at 420 percent capacity. They had brought it down from 5000 per day to 3500 per day. The facility was not built for that. While I was there, as a woman and a mother, I was concerned about young women being smuggled into the country brought across without any parental support or parental guidance, and ask them about pregnancy, rape, sexual assault, and they informed me that the week before they had an 11 year old girl recently pregnant and a girl between 11 and 15 who, the day she arrived at that facility, gave birth to twins. So does pregnancy put individuals are these young people, they’re not being tested for COVID, we already know that, but does it put them at a higher risk for severe illness from COVID-19?” [CQ, 4/15/21]

September 2021: Miller-Meeks Said Haitian Immigrants Coming From South America Were Bringing The COVID-19 Lambda Variant Into The United States

September 2021: Miller-Meeks Said Haitian Immigrants Coming From South America Were Bringing The COVID-19 Lambda Variant Into The United States. MILLER-MEEKS: “So, I think it’s patently absurd to say that we wouldn’t have expected the delta variant. You know, in South America, the Haitians coming from South America may carry the lambda variant with them, which is surging in South America right now. So, we can expect another variant to come into this country.” [Fox News, 9/30/21] (VIDEO) 00:03:05

Border Wall
Miller-Meeks Said That Under Biden The United States Was “Still Paying For [Border Wall] Construction That’s Not Going On.” HOST: “Do you think the Biden administration has been sending mixed messages about the open border?” MILLER-MEEKS: “Absolutely, they said it all during the campaign in 2020. They said it when they went into office. The first thing that they did on January 20th, was an executive order to stop construction of the border wall. Meanwhile, we’re still paying for that construction that’s not going on. So, you know, they may say that the border is closed, but the border is de facto open. We’re not testing for COVID-19. We’re not vaccinating. And we’ve got Haitian, you know, migrants coming up from South America. And we know that the lambda variant is prevalent in South America. So, you know, it’s a crisis.” [YouTube, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 9/29/21] (VIDEO) 00:00:21

Miller-Meeks: “Not Only Is There Funding Already There For The Portion Of The Wall, But We’re Still Paying People To Not To Do Work.” “The border agents have also told Congress members any efforts to build the wall promised by former President Donald Trump was halted the day before Biden’s inauguration. Because of this, Miller-Meek said there were lines of unused construction equipment at the site, which she views as both a safety and financial hazard. ‘We’re still paying those contractors for that wall that was supposed to be built,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘Not only is there funding already there for the portion of the wall, but we’re still paying people not to do work. All of that equipment is laying on the ground unused, so it’s a hazard.’” [Oskaloosa Herald, 4/19/21]

Miller-Meeks Repeatedly Expressed Support For Building The Border Wall

September 2021: Miller-Meeks Said “We Need To Build The Wall” And “Put Back In Place Those Policies That Trump Put In Place.” MILLER-MEEKS: “Every country has the right to secure its borders. We’re a sovereign nation. It is important. We need to build the wall. We need to get a handle on immigration. And we need to put back in place those policies that Trump put in place.” [YouTube, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 9/29/21] (VIDEO) 00:03:16

November 2019: Miller-Meeks Said “We Need To Have A Border Wall.” “I think a border wall is only one part of the entire immigration system, but we need to have a border wall. One, we know that we have drug trafficking that’s coming from our southern border. Two, we also know that there’s human trafficking. Both of these issues are extremely important, they’re real, and they’re a crisis at our southern border now. So a border wall certainly has the opportunity for us to protect our southern border, reduce both drug trafficking and human trafficking, and reduce the effect of the cartels that are coming into our country.” [YouTube, Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 11/14/19] (VIDEO) 00:00:50

Children At The Border

July 2021: Miller-Meeks Sponsored A Bill Requiring HHS To Keep Closer Track Of Unaccompanied Alien Children

July 2021: Miller-Meeks Sponsored A Bill Requiring HHS To Keep Closer Track Of Unaccompanied Alien Children. On July 9, 2021, Miller-Meeks sponsored HR 4391, the Responsibility for Unaccompanied Minors Act, which “amends provisions relating to responsibilities of the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) for the care of unaccompanied alien children. The Office of Refugee Resettlement of HHS may provide care for an unaccompanied alien child until the conclusion of the child’s immigration proceedings or the child reaching 18 years of age, whichever occurs first. Before placing an unaccompanied alien child with a sponsor, the office shall evaluate the child’s future need for follow-up services. Before placing an accompanied alien child, HHS shall (1) require the proposed sponsor to execute a sponsor care agreement, (2) notify the welfare agency of the state where the child will be placed, and (3) conduct a background check of the sponsor and all adults living in the household in
which the child will reside. Under the care agreement, each sponsor shall agree to (1) provide for the child’s physical and mental well-being, and (2) ensure the child’s presence at immigration proceedings and compliance with all court and agency orders. HHS shall assume physical custody of a child if the non-parent or legal guardian sponsor fails to comply with the care agreement. HHS shall periodically report to Congress on instances where a sponsor failed to comply with a care agreement. The Department of Justice shall increase the number of immigration judge teams by at least 225.” The bill was read twice and referred to House Judiciary. [HR 4391, Sponsored, 7/9/21; CQ, 7/9/21]

- **Miller-Meeks Said The Bill “Would Protect Vulnerable Children From Traffickers And Ensure That They Appear For Their Court Proceedings.”** “Today, July 9th, 2021, Reps. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02) and Henry Cuellar (TX-28) introduced the Responsibility for Unaccompanied Minors Act. This bicameral and bipartisan legislation would clarify the responsibilities of the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) and require them to provide additional protections and keep better track of and care for unaccompanied alien children (UACs). [...] ‘Our border patrol agents and law enforcement officers are struggling to deal with the current surge of UACs crossing our southern border. Holding facilities and immigration courts are overwhelmed, and the number of UACs crossing remains at crisis levels,’ said Miller-Meeks. ‘Our bipartisan legislation would protect vulnerable children from traffickers and ensure that they appear for their court proceedings. We have to work to make sure that these children are safe, healthy, and protected.’” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 7/9/21]

### Miller-Meeks Alleged That Biden Policies Resulted In Unaccompanied Minors And Smuggled Infants At The Southern Border

**Miller-Meeks Said She Had “Seen No Action From The Biden Administration To Dis-Incentivize Smugglers From Bringing Children As Young As One Across The Border.”** “MILLER-MEEKS: So you agree, Secretary Becerra agrees, and I agree that these smugglers and traffickers are putting children in danger. Yet, we have seen no action from the Biden administration to dis-incentivize smugglers from bringing children as young as one across the border. If we’re serious about protecting children, we need to stop making it profitable for smugglers to bring children into the U.S. Your administration’s open border messaging is putting children’s lives at risk, and 79,948 children have crossed our southwest border. While I was in the Rio Grande Valley Sector earlier this year, border patrol agents told me that migrants are paying on average $4000 apiece to be smuggled into the United States. Human smugglers are openly advertising their services on Facebook, claiming that they can promise a 100 percent safe journey. These cartels are making billions of dollars smuggling individuals and drugs into our country. Because of this, your agents told me that they feel like we are aiding and embedding transnational criminal organizations and that the policies of the previous administration were working. If we want to tackle root causes, as the Biden administration continues to state, then we should not be promoting policies that enrich the cartels and lead to worsening corruption in the Northern Triangle countries.” [CQ, 6/17/21]

**Cedar Rapids Gazette:** “Miller-Meeks Blamed President Joe Biden’s Administration For Rolling Back Trump-Era Immigration Policies That Turned Unaccompanied Minors Away At The Border.” “As U.S. officials race to address the rising number of children crossing the U.S.-Mexico border, Iowa Republican U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks blamed President Joe Biden’s administration for rolling back Trump-era immigration policies that turned unaccompanied minors away at the border and for halting border wall construction. ‘You send the message that the border is not open to anybody to cross,’ Miller-Meeks told CNN Newsroom on Tuesday. ‘We shouldn’t be encouraging minors to come across unaccompanied.’” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 3/16/21]

### Family Separation

**Miller-Meeks Called Potential Compensation To Immigrant Families Separated During The Trump Administration “A Slap In The Face To Hard-Working And Law-Abiding Americans”**
Miller-Meeks Voted Against Blocking Consideration Of Preventing Settlement Payments For Immigrant Families Separated Under The Trump Administration. In November 2021 Miller-Meeks voted against: “McGovern, D-Mass., motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and possibility of amendment).” According to the Congressional Record, Rep. Burgess said, “If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to immediately consider the Illegal Immigrant Payoff Prohibition Act, introduced by Mr. MCCLINTOCK. This bill will prevent the Attorney General from making settlement payments to individuals and families who have entered the country illegally for claims arising out of the illegal entry.” A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of the bill. The motion was agreed to by a vote of 221-213. [H. Res. 774, Vote #371, 11/6/21; CQ, 11/6/21; Congressional Record, 11/5/21]

Miller-Meeks Said Potential Compensation For Immigrants Who Unlawfully Crossed The Border In 2018 Was “A Slap In The Face To Hard-Working And Law-Abiding Americans Across The Country.” “Today, October 29th, 2021, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02) joined over 40 of her colleagues, led by Rep. Greg Murphy (NC-03), in a letter to Homeland Security Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas, Health and Human Services Secretary Xavier Becerra, and Attorney General Merrick Garland regarding reports that their agencies are in discussions to offer illegal immigrants that unlawfully crossed the border in 2018 roughly $450,000 per person in compensation. ‘These reports are a slap in the face to hard-working and law-abiding Americans across the country. Iowans should not be paying more at the pump and in the store while watching as their tax dollars are being sent to individuals who willingly broke the law,’ said Miller-Meeks. ‘This Administration repeatedly drops the ball and ignores the very real border, energy, and inflation crises that Americans are enduring every day. This is an unacceptable use of taxpayer dollars.’” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 10/29/21]

- Wall Street Journal: The Payments Were Intended To “Resolve Lawsuits Filed On Behalf Of Parents And Children Who Say The Government Subjected Them To Lasting Psychological Trauma.” “The Biden administration is in talks to offer immigrant families that were separated during the Trump administration around $450,000 a person in compensation, according to people familiar with the matter, as several agencies work to resolve lawsuits filed on behalf of parents and children who say the government subjected them to lasting psychological trauma.” [Wall Street Journal, 10/28/21]

**DACA, DAPA, & The DREAM Act**

**March 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Dream Act Providing Residency Status For Undocumented Immigrants Who Entered The US As Children Or From TPS-Designated Nation**

Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Dream Act, Providing Residency Status For Undocumented Immigrants Who Entered The US As Children Or From TPS-Designated Nations. In March 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against: “Passage of the bill that would provide legal residency status for certain undocumented immigrants who entered the United States as children or from nations with Temporary Protected Status designation and would prohibit the Homeland Security and Justice Departments from initiating or continuing the removal of such individuals.” The bill passed 228 to 197. [HR 6, Vote #91, 3/18/21; CQ, 3/18/21]

**March 2021: Miller-Meeks Said “One Of The Issues With DACA In My View Was That It Was Through Executive Order, Not Through Legislation”**

Miller-Meeks: “One Of The Issues With DACA In My View Was That It Was Through Executive Order, Not Through Legislation.” “MILLER-MEEKS: No, I think certainly, there needs – you know, the immigration system has been broken for decades. This is not a new problem or new issue. And I think certainly there’s a willingness to enhance border security and also look at immigration. And as you mentioned, looking at the dreamers or DACA and how do we do that? You know, one of the issues with DACA in my view was that it was through executive order, not through legislation. So, certainly, I am more than willing to sit down with members of both parties in order to hammer out how we can address border security, how we can help our Customs and Border Patrol agents there at the border now doing a tremendous task of processing and protecting us and protecting our
July 2021: Miller-Meeks Said Some Of The Immigration Bills Introduced In Congress Would Include More Potential Beneficiaries Than She Could Support

Miller-Meeks Said She Supported A Pathway To Citizenship For DACA Recipients, But Some Immigration Bills Would Include More Potential Beneficiaries Than She Could Support. “Miller-Meeks also supports a similar pathway to citizenship for DACA recipients, like many other Republicans. But she said some of the bills that have been introduced included a greater number of potential beneficiaries than she could support. She referenced how the original DACA program under former President Barack Obama gave protection to about 600,000 ‘Dreamers.’ Former President Donald Trump negotiated with U.S. House Speaker Nancy Pelosi a deal that would help around 1.8 million. She said bills introduced in Congress this year have put that number at more than 4 million. ‘That is problematic, but in general, yes, I believe children who have come here with their parents, even though they came here illegally ... I certainly think that is part of the immigration system and reform that I would support,’ she said.” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 7/19/21]

July 2021: Miller-Meeks Introduced Legislation To Authorize Permanent Resident Status For Certain Documented Dreamers

Miller-Meeks Introduced The America’s CHILDREN Act Which Would Authorize Permanent Resident Status For Certain Documented Dreamers Who Graduate From College. “Miller-Meeks, a Republican, introduced H.R. 4331 to potentially help people like Mhatre. It is known as America's Cultivation of Hope and Inclusion for Long-Term Dependents Raised and Educated Natively Act. She was joined by Reps. Deborah Ross of North Carolina, Young Kim of California and Raja Krishnamoorthi of Illinois. The America’s CHILDREN Act would amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to authorize lawful permanent resident status for documented Dreamers who have maintained a legal status in the United States for at least 10 years if they graduate from an institution of higher education here. ‘These are people who, for all practical purposes, are Americans and only know of one country. And they're tremendously valuable assets to our country,’ Miller-Meeks said.” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 7/19/21]

Miller-Meeks Accused Biden Administration Of Abandoning Dreamers To Focus On Bringing “Illegal Aliens As Fast As They Can Into The Country”

Miller-Meeks Said The Biden Administration Was Forgetting About Documented Dreamers And “Trying To Transit Illegal Aliens As Fast As They Can Into The Country.” “Miller-Meeks said the bill's sponsors chose to introduce this legislation in large part because the U.S. Senate's Dream Act leaves out documented Dreamers, while the U.S. House of Representatives, called the American Dream and Promise Act, includes retroactive protections for them. Miller-Meeks also said that, while a pathway to citizenship for documented Dreamers is left out of the Dream Act, President Joe Biden's administration ‘is trying to transit illegal aliens as fast as they can into the country.’ She believes documented Dreamers, like Mhatre, who have been living in the country legally for years should be a priority in any immigration reform. ‘We should do everything we can to keep them in the United States,’ she said.” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 7/19/21]

Path To Citizenship

Oskaloosa Herald: Miller-Meeks Said She Thought It Was “Unfair To Allow Illegal Immigrants To Enter U.S. Grounds Immediately” While Those Pursuing Legal Processes Of Entry Waited Years

Oskaloosa Herald: Miller-Meeks Said She Thought It Was “Unfair To Allow Illegal Immigrants To Enter
Miller-Meeks: “It Needs To Be Easier And Faster For People To Come Here, Who Come Here Legally, To Become Citizens Of This Great Country.” “Miller-Meeks said, if the bill gets attached to a larger package on immigration reform, she would have to weigh the entirety of the package — the other bills, the regulations, impact and unintended consequences — before deciding her support ‘It needs to be easier and faster for people to come here, who come here legally, to become citizens of this great country,’ she said. ‘This is just one facet of a broken immigration system.’” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 7/19/21]

2020: Miller-Meeks Said Naturalization Should Be Fast-Track For Those Pursuing Legal Processes Of Entry

Muscatine Journal: “Miller-Meeks Said Naturalization Should Be Fast-Track For Those Who Came To The Country Legally.” On the topic of immigration, Scheinblum asked the candidates what kind of reform they would implement beyond building the wall. […] Miller-Meeks said naturalization should be fast-track for those who came to the county legally. Schilling said his father supported a merit-based immigration system and placing a priority on the nuclear family instead of allowing visas for extended family members.” [Muscatine Journal, 5/27/20]

2019: Miller-Meeks Called For “More Immediate Approval For People To Become Citizens Of Our Country,” Rather Than What She Said Were Current Wait Times Of 12 Or 16 Years

Miller-Meeks Called For “More Immediate Approval For People To Become Citizens Of Our Country,” Rather Than What She Said Were Current Wait Times Of 12 Or 16 Years. “A certain party, our Democrat party, our Democrat colleagues, want to have open borders. There needs to be an immigration system that’s reformed, that has a more immediate approval for people to become citizens of our country. It shouldn’t take you 12 or 16 years to become a legal citizen. We need to have borders, because without secure borders you’re not a country and you’re not sovereign.” [YouTube, Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 11/14/19] (VIDEO) 00:00:20

2014: Miller-Meeks Said She Wanted The Government To Control Illegal Immigration Better, But Fully Supported Legal Immigration

Miller-Meeks Said She Wanted The Government To Control Illegal Immigration Better, But Fully Supported Legal Immigration. “Miller-Meeks responded to another question about immigration and was asked what she would do to keep immigrants from taking low-skill jobs from Americans. While Miller-Meeks wants the government to do a better job of controlling illegal immigrants, she showed full support for legal immigration.” [The Hawk Eye, 8/14/14]

Civil Rights

April 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against A Bill Requiring Homeland Security To Provide Access to Counsel For All Individuals Subject To Extra Inspection When Entering The Country

Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Access To Counsel Act, Requiring Homeland Security To Provide Access to Counsel For All Individuals Subject To Secondary Or Deferred Inspection When Entering The Country. In April 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against: “Passage of the bill that would require the Homeland Security Department to provide access to counsel for all individuals subject to a secondary or deferred inspection when seeking admission to the United States, effective 180 days after enactment. Specifically, it would require the department to
allow such individuals to consult, including via telephone, with legal representation and a relative, petitioner or other connection within the United States within the first hour of a secondary inspection and as necessary throughout the inspection process. It would authorize the counsel to advocate on behalf of the individual by providing documentation and other evidence to the examining immigration officer. It would require DHS to accommodate, to the greatest extent practicable, a request by the individual for in-person counsel at the inspection site. It would also prohibit the department from accepting paperwork from lawful permanent residents subject to secondary or deferred inspection that would give up such individuals' legal immigration status without providing them the opportunity to seek advice from counsel.” The bill passed 217 to 207. [HR 1573, Vote #129, 4/21/21; CQ, 4/21/21]

### 2008: Miller-Meeks Called For The Government To Secure Borders And Collect And Use Biometric Data To Identify Undocumented Americans

Ottumwa Courier: Miller-Meeks Wanted “The Government To Secure Borders And Use Biometric Data To Identify People Who May Be In The Country Illegally.” “Miller-Meeks points to immigration as one of the tough issues in the country. People understand what drives illegal immigrants to the United States, but they reject the idea that coming to the country illegally is somehow acceptable. Amnesty is not a solution, she said. The 1980s amnesty vote was supposed to stop illegal immigration, but it failed. She wants the government to secure borders and use biometric data to identify people who may be in the country illegally.” [The Ottumwa Courier, 5/21/08]

### Crime & Terrorism

Miller-Meeks Said The Biden Administration Had Not Taken Adequate Action To Deter Smuggling And Other Criminal Activity At The Border

Miller-Meeks: “We Should Not Be Promoting Policies That Enrich The Cartels And Lead To Worsening Corruption In The Northern Triangle Countries.” “MILLER-MEEKS: So you agree, Secretary Becerra agrees, and I agree that these smugglers and traffickers are putting children in danger. Yet, we have seen no action from the Biden administration to dis-incentivize smugglers from bringing children as young as one across the border. If we're serious about protecting children, we need to stop making it profitable for smugglers to bring children into the U.S. Your administration's open border messaging is putting children's lives at risk, and 79,948 children have crossed our southwest border. While I was in the Rio Grande Valley Sector earlier this year, border patrol agents told me that migrants are paying on average $4000 apiece to be smuggled into the United States. Human smugglers are openly advertising their services on Facebook, claiming that they can promise a 100 percent safe journey. These cartels are making billions of dollars smuggling individuals and drugs into our country. Because of this, your agents told me that they feel like we are aiding and embedding transnational criminal organizations and that the policies of the previous administration were working. If we want to tackle root causes, as the Biden administration continues to state, then we should not be promoting policies that enrich the cartels and lead to worsening corruption in the Northern Triangle countries.” [CQ, 6/17/21]

Miller-Meeks Claimed “Human Smugglers Are Openly Advertising Their Services On Facebook” And That Cartels Were Making Billions Of Dollars Smuggling Individuals And Drugs Into The United States. “While I was in the Rio Grande Valley Sector earlier this year, border patrol agents told me that migrants are paying on average $4000 apiece to be smuggled into the United States. Human smugglers are openly advertising their services on Facebook, claiming that they can promise a 100 percent safe journey. These cartels are making billions of dollars smuggling individuals and drugs into our country. Because of this, your agents told me that they feel like we are aiding and embedding transnational criminal organizations and that the policies of the previous administration were working.” [CQ, 6/17/21]

Miller-Meeks Said She Had “Seen No Action From The Biden Administration To Dis-Incentivize Smugglers From Bringing Children As Young As One Across The Border.” “MILLER-MEEKS: So you agree, Secretary Becerra agrees, and I agree that these smugglers and traffickers are putting children in danger. Yet, we have seen no...
action from the Biden administration to dis-incentivize smugglers from bringing children as young as one across the border. If we're serious about protecting children, we need to stop making it profitable for smugglers to bring children into the U.S.” [CQ, 6/17/21]

Miller-Meeks: “This Is A Huge Racket Where The Cartels And Smugglers Make Money Off These Families And These Poor Children.” “These individuals are coming over here because they want a better life, they want to work, and they're coming illegally but they are at the behest of the cartels and smugglers. This is a huge racket where the cartels and smugglers make money off these families and these poor children.” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 3/18/21] (VIDEO)

May 2021: Miller-Meeks Claimed People On The Terror Watch List Were Coming Across The Southern Border

Miller-Meeks Claimed People On The Terror Watch List Were Coming Across The Southern Border. “So, there's chaos there. There are drugs, there are human smuggling, as we know, the cartels are making tremendous amounts of money and bringing people across the border. And then there's also individuals on the terror watch list who are coming across the border. So, it's imperative that we secure our border, and then also work our broken immigration system.” [Fox News, 5/28/21] (VIDEO) 00:01:34

Employment & Employment Visas

October 2021: Miller-Meeks Sponsored A Bill Authorizing USCIS To Award Unused Employment Visas From FY2020 And FY2021 To Eligible Applicants After September 30, 2021

October 2021: Miller-Meeks Sponsored A Bill Authorizing USCIS To Award Unused Employment Visas From FY2020 And FY2021 To Eligible Applicants After September 30, 2021. On October 5, 2021, Miller-Meeks sponsored HR 5498, the Preserving Employment Visas Act, which would “authorize U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services to process employment-based immigrant visa applications after September 30, 2021, and to award such visas to eligible applicants from the pool of unused employment-based immigrant visas during fiscal years 2020 and 2021.” The bill was read twice and referred to House Judiciary. [HR 5498, Sponsored, 10/5/21; CQ, 10/5/21]

September 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against An Amendment To Provide For Special Immigrant Status For “Essential” Scientists And Technical Experts

September 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against An Amendment To Provide For Special Immigrant Status For “Essential” Scientists And Technical Experts. In September 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against: “Langevin, D-R.I., amendment no. 42 that would provide for special immigrant status to allow for admission of "essential" scientists and technical experts to promote and protect the national security innovation base.” The amendment was adopted by a vote of 225 to 187. [HR 4350, Vote #286, 9/23/21; CQ, 9/24/21]

March 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Farm Workforce Modernization Act, Allowing Undocumented Agricultural Workers To Apply For Residency Status

March 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Farm Workforce Modernization Act, Allowing Undocumented Agricultural Workers To Apply For Residency Status. In March 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against: “Passage of the bill that would allow certain undocumented agricultural workers in the United States to apply for certified agricultural worker status and subsequently permanent residency status. It would also overhaul the H-2A nonimmigrant visa program for temporary agricultural workers and replace the E-Verify employment status verification system with a similar system for use by the agricultural sector; and authorize funding for certain
September 2020: Miller-Meeks Called For Faster Immigration And A Guest Worker Program For People Who Come To The United States To Work Legally

“Miller-Meeks fielded questions from business representatives on a variety of topics. (Hart will have a similar session at 10 a.m. Oct. 22). The sessions were arranged by the Partnership, Young Professionals Connection and the Greater Des Moines Leadership Institute. […] ‘I think there needs to be a lot of policy changes. I work with people who immigrated here from a variety of different countries. They’re wonderful people. They add tremendous benefit to our community, both locally, throughout the state and nationally. We see immigrants who are the heads of Fortune 500 companies that bring ideas energy, motivation, different perspectives, and a work ethic into our country. For someone who comes to work in this country, comes here legally, for it to take 12 to 16 years to become a legal citizen is way too long. We need to revamp the immigration system so we have faster immigration. We do need to have a guest worker program.’” [Iowa Capital Dispatch, 9/10/20]

2019: Miller-Meeks Co-Sponsored And Voted For A Bill That Required Iowa Employers To Use E-Verify To Verify The Immigration Statuses Of Their Employees

Miller-Meeks Co-Sponsored A Bill That Required Iowa Employers To Use E-Verify To Verify The Immigration Statuses Of Their Employees. “Twenty-six Republican Senators are listed as co-sponsors of a bill introduced in the Iowa legislature, identified as S.F. 243 (2019). Ignoring the explanation in the bill – the ‘prohibits employers from knowingly employing unauthorized aliens’ – what S.F. 243 does is to require virtually every Iowa employer in the state to utilize the federal ‘E-Verify’ program. And failure to comply with its provisions can result in some fairly Draconian sanctions, including the loss of all licenses that might be required to do business in this state.” [LexBlog, Iowa Immigration Blog, 2/27/19; Iowa Legislature, S.F. 243, Introduced 2/12/19]

2019: Miller-Meeks Voted For Requiring Employers To Verify Employee Immigration Status. Miller-Meeks voted for SF 516, “a bill for an act relating to the employment of unauthorized aliens and providing penalties.” The bill passed by vote 33-14. [Iowa State Legislature, SF 516, 4/2/19]

2014: Miller-Meeks Said We Need To Look Into Whether “Lower-Skilled Workers Displace People Who Are Also Lower-Skilled”

Miller-Meeks: “We Can Revamp Our Immigration System, Secure Our Borders, And We Do Need To Look At Immigration And Whether Lower-Skilled Workers Displace People Who Are Also Lower-Skilled.” “Miller-Meeks responded to another question about immigration and was asked what she would do to keep immigrants from taking low-skill jobs from Americans. […] ‘We can revamp our immigration system, secure our borders, and we do need to look at immigration and whether lower-skilled workers displace people who are also lower-skilled.’” [The Hawk Eye, 8/14/14]

2008: Miller-Meeks Said She Wanted Stiff Penalties For Employers Who Give Jobs To Illegal Immigrants

Miller-Meeks Said She Wanted Stiff Penalties For Employers Who Give Jobs To Illegal Immigrants. “Should you be able to say laws don’t apply to me at this time? she asked. ‘There has to be some benefit to being a citizen of this country and following the laws of this country.’ Miller-Meeks favors a fast-track system for allowing visas and stiff penalties for employers who give jobs to illegal immigrants.” [The Ottumwa Courier, 5/21/08]
2008: Miller-Meeks Said She Favored A Fast-Track System For Allowing Visas

Miller-Meeks Favored A Fast-Track System For Allowing Visas. “Should you be able to say laws don’t apply to me at this time? she asked. ‘There has to be some benefit to being a citizen of this country and following the laws of this country.’ Miller-Meeks favors a fast-track system for allowing visas and stiff penalties for employers who give jobs to illegal immigrants.” [The Ottumwa Courier, 5/21/08]

Border Patrol/ICE

Miller-Meeks Said Progressives Were Trying To “Denigrate And Demean” Border Patrol Agents In Service Of An Agenda To “Defund The Police” And “Get Rid Of ICE”

Miller-Meeks Said Progressives Were Trying To “Denigrate And Demean” Border Patrol Agents On Horseback To “Further Their Narrative” Because They Want To “Defund The Police” And “Get Rid Of ICE.” MILLER-MEEKS: “Either people haven't been around horses or they've never been on horseback. It's obvious when you look at the video, when you look at photographs, that they're trying to manage their reins so, in fact, the horse, which they get skittish among a lot of people, so that the horse doesn't do anything. And I think they are looking for ways to criticize this. You know, the progressives on the left want to defund the police, they want to get rid of ICE, they want open borders. So, they think if they portray this narrative and they denigrate and demean the Border Patrol that they'll be able to further their narrative. So, it's just atrocious. It's obvious what this border patrol agent is doing, and he's trying to protect those people on the ground and prevent the horse from going forward.” [Fox Business, 9/22/21] (VIDEO) 00:02:29

Miller-Meeks: “We Need To Be Doing More To Support Our Brave Customs And Border Patrol Agents” Who Risk Their Lives Every Day. “Members toured the El Paso Central Processing Center and border fence, and spoke with Border Patrol agents about the challenges they are facing. ‘We have unaccompanied minors crossing illegally, smugglers and traffickers bringing narcotics, individuals on the terror watch list, and positive COVID-19 tests crossing our border with Mexico,’ Miller-Meeks said in a statement. ‘We need to be doing more to support our brave Customs and Border Patrol agents. They are putting their lives at risk every day and facing physical, mental, and health challenges that are going unaddressed. Congress must immediately act to address the disorder at the border.’” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 3/16/21]

2014: Miller-Meeks Said She Wanted To Hire More Immigration Agents To Speed Up The Immigration Process

Miller-Meeks Said She Wanted The Government To Do A Better Job Of Controlling Illegal Immigrants By Hiring More “Immigration Agents To Have Faster, More Efficient Legal Immigration.” “Miller-Meeks responded to another question about immigration and was asked what she would do to keep immigrants from taking low-skill jobs from Americans. […] ‘Why aren’t we hiring more immigration agents to have faster, more efficient legal immigration? I have friends in Ottumwa who came to this country legally, and it has taken them 12 to 16 years to become a citizen. They do phenomenal work as physicians. They contribute. They volunteer. They raise their families here,’ she said. ‘Twelve to 16 years to become a citizen is too long. We can revamp our immigration system, secure our borders, and we do need to look at immigration and whether lower-skilled workers displace people who are also lower-skilled.’” [The Hawk Eye, 8/14/14]

General

Miller-Meeks: “To Me, Every State Is A Border State”
Miller-Meeks: “To Me, Every State Is A Border State.” “Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We’ve certainly heard about the threats that are facing our homeland, and we’ve heard about the border. Like Representative Pfluger, I visited the border. And to me, every state is a border state.” [CQ, 7/15/21]

Miller-Meeks Alleged That Democrats “Want To Have Open Borders”

Miller-Meeks Alleged That Democrats “Want To Have Open Borders.” “A certain party, our Democrat party, our Democrat colleagues, want to have open borders. There needs to be an immigration system that’s reformed, that has a more immediate approval for people to become citizens of our country. It shouldn’t take you 12 or 16 years to become a legal citizen. We need to have borders, because without secure borders you’re not a country and you’re not sovereign.” [YouTube, Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 11/14/19] (VIDEO) 00:00:20

2015: Miller-Meeks Urged Marco Rubio Not To Retreat From Immigration Overhaul

Miller-Meeks Urged Marco Rubio Not To Retreat From Immigration Overhaul. “At a recent ice cream social here, Jim Hallihan liked what he heard from Senator Marco Rubio. […] Last month, when Mr. Rubio made his first trip to Iowa after announcing his campaign, he was confronted at a closed-door meeting by Mariannette Miller-Meeks, a former congressional candidate, who pointedly urged him not to retreat from an immigration overhaul. ‘My advice to Senator Rubio was to be honest with people, be yourself,’ Ms. Miller-Meeks said afterward, ‘because that will carry a lot of weight.’” [The New York Times, 5/8/15]

2010: Miller-Meeks: Called For Securing “All Four” Of The Nation’s Borders, Including The Atlantic And Pacific Oceans

Miller-Meeks: Called For Securing “All Four” Of The Nation’s Borders, Including The Atlantic And Pacific Oceans. “In a two-hour session spent mostly on questions and answers, Miller-Meeks touched on a number of issues: On immigration reform, she called for securing “all four” of the nation’s borders (including the Atlantic and Pacific oceans) and renewing a guest worker program for seasonal workers.” [Muscatine Journal, 7/19/10]

2010: Miller-Meeks Advocated Rewriting Immigration Law Because “We’re Stronger Because Of Our Diversity”

2010: Miller-Meeks Advocated Rewriting Immigration Law Because “We’re Stronger Because Of Our Diversity.” “Immigrants are needed, said Miller-Meeks, advocating rewriting immigration law. ‘We’re stronger because of our diversity,’ she said.” [Globe Gazette, 2/6/10]
**Infrastructure & Transportation Issues**

### Significant Findings

- Miller-Meeks advocated for a bipartisan infrastructure bill in 2020 and 2021 – then voted against the Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill granting southeast Iowa $100 million for bridge repair – then requested funds from the legislation.

- Miller-Meeks said congressional Democrats should have focused on passing a bipartisan infrastructure bill in 2021, and called for a “big infrastructure bill” while campaigning in 2020.

- November 2021: Miller-Meeks voted against the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs act, providing $550 billion in new infrastructure spending and creating millions of jobs.
  - Associated Press: Miller-Meeks “objected to majority Democrats’ handling of the bill, never mentioning its contents” instead of addressing district needs.
  - Associated Press: The Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act “would pour more than $100 million in federal money to repair and replace bridges into southwest Iowa.”
  - Iowa’s 2nd congressional district had the second-most troubled bridges in the country, including key bridges connecting the Quad Cities and a bridge linking a key freight route.

- December 2021: Miller-Meeks joined a letter asking for funds from the Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill to be allocated to river locks and dams in Iowa.

- Miller-Meeks voted against the INVEST in America Act that included more than $15 million for projects in her district, including those she had requested funding for.
  - Miller-Meeks voted against the INVEST in America Act, which would authorize more than $720 billion in transportation and water infrastructure projects, calling it too costly.
  - Miller-Meeks wrote an op-ed touting the “opportunity to invest in infrastructure we have long known was in need of repair” days after voting against infrastructure funding.

- The INVEST in America Act included more than $15 million for projects in Iowa’s 2nd congressional district, many of which she requested funds for herself.

- Miller-Meeks voted against millions of dollars of her own earmarks.
  - 2021: Miller-Meeks requested a total of $36,650,000 in earmarks.
  - Eight of Miller-Meeks’ community project funding requests totaling $32,900,000 were included in a group of appropriations bills she voted against.
  - Miller-Meeks voted against infrastructure funding she requested for her district days before writing an op-ed touting the “opportunity to invest in infrastructure we have long known was in need of repair.”

Miller-Meeks voted against the Bipartisan Infrastructure Deal that included an investment of $65 billion in broadband access for rural areas, low-income families, and tribal communities.

Miller-Meeks Advocated For A Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill, But Voted Against The Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill Granting Southeast Iowa $100 Million For Bridge Repair – Then Requested Funds From The Legislation

Miller-Meeks Said Congressional Democrats Should Have Focused On Passing A Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill Throughout 2021

Miller-Meeks Said Democrats Should “Pass An Infrastructure Bill” Because “They Would Have Bipartisan Support For That.” HOST: “If it’s such a great plan, why do they need to beg their own party to get on board?” MILLER-MEEKS: “They don’t need to beg their own party. Pass an infrastructure bill. They would have bipartisan support for that. Forget the other bill because they’re having difficulty even among their own party to get it through.” [YouTube, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 10/27/21] (VIDEO) 00:03:39

Miller-Meeks Said She Wanted Congress To Focus On Infrastructure And Should Be “Coming Together As Both Parties To Figure Out How We Fund Them.” “Iowa’s 2nd District Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks said she hoped Congress would focus on infrastructure alone. The bill, she said, will help Iowans with things like waterways, bridges, dams, and airports. ‘Concentrating on those things as infrastructure, and then coming together as both parties to figure out how we fund them, and what we need to do about our funding,’ Miller-Meeks said.” [Daily Iowan, 10/17/21]

Miller-Meeks Said She Could Support An Infrastructure Package That Was Focused On “Traditional Infrastructure” And “Doesn’t Raise Taxes.” NIEDLEMAN: “Now, there’s a lot of focus on this bipartisan group of 10 senators to come up with an infrastructure deal. How confident are you that they’ll come up with something that you can support?” MILLER-MEEKS: “Well, I think if you have a bill that is focused on infrastructure, such as roads, bridges, locks and dams, waterways, airports, broadband, and then the electric grid infrastructure, which sometimes gets lost in this infrastructure bill, and doesn’t raise taxes, then I think it’s something that I could support. So, traditional infrastructure. The original bill that was floated had 115 billion for roads and bridges out of $2.3 trillion, and I think most people would say that’s a bill that’s very short-sighted. So, I think, you know, if it focuses on infrastructure, which we all agree with, then I do have confidence that something can come about that would be bipartisan, and I could vote for it.” [YouTube, Local 4 News WHBF, 6/20/21] (VIDEO)

Miller-Meeks: An Infrastructure Framework Around $1 Trillion Was “Workable” But If Further Spending Plans Included Tax Increases, “Negotiations Could Falter Once Again.” MILLER-MEEKS: “So, you know, a framework in the trillion-dollar range that's been compromised between both the Democrats and the Republican senators is something that's workable. You know, there's bipartisan support for an infrastructure bill. There's just not bipartisan support for a Democrat wish list which is what they're trying to push forward, which would include tax increases. So, I think the you know, the devil is in the details, as usual. And so, if they have a compromise of 1 trillion, but they're still floating this 6 trillion out there, where there would be tax increases, I think that it's possible that negotiations could falter once again.” [YouTube, Fox News, 6/19/21] 00:02:44 (VIDEO)

Miller-Meeks Op-Ed: Getting The Nation Back To Work After COVID-19 Was “Also An Opportunity To Invest In Infrastructure We Have Long Known Was In Need Of Repair.” “Iowans have reason to be optimistic. The state and the country are getting back to business, but the reality is the COVID-19 pandemic scarred our economy. Although Iowa businesses are challenged by a lack of workers, nationwide too many people continue to struggle with unemployment. In order to get our economy running at full capacity, it is important we get the
nation back to work. It’s also an opportunity to invest in infrastructure we have long known was in need of repair.” [Ottumwa Courier, Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 7/6/21]

**Miller-Meeks Had Called For A “Big Infrastructure Bill” While Campaigning In 2020**

*Cedar Rapids Gazette: Miller-Meeks “Called For A ‘Big Infrastructure Bill’ Before Taking Office, But It Is Unknown How She Will Vote” On The Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill.* “Sen. Chuck Grassley, who touted his vote for a $1.2 trillion infrastructure package as an investment in Iowa’s future, isn’t advising his Iowa GOP House colleagues one way or the other as they prepare to vote on the plan Thursday. […] Third [sic] District Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks called for a ‘big infrastructure bill’ before taking office, but it is unknown how she will vote.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 9/29/21]

**January 2021: Upon Her Swearing In, Miller-Meeks Cited Infrastructure As An Area Where Legislators Could “Move Things In A Bipartisan Fashion.”** “Miller-Meeks said she is hopeful the diverse class of female freshmen will lend itself to more bipartisanship in a divided Congress, with narrow margins in both the House and Senate. ‘I think there are avenues and things that we can agree on, and I think there is an appetite to work together and accomplish that,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘I think you especially see that in the women legislators, but in all legislators. … I do think we can accomplish things and we can, you know, move things in a bipartisan fashion.’ She said that includes ‘getting through pandemic and preparing for the next pandemic’; ‘bringing manufacturing back from China’ to address limited domestic stockpiles in medical supplies — including personal protective equipment (PPE) and pharmaceuticals — as the nation grapples with containing COVID-19; and pushing forward a long-stalled infrastructure spending bill to upgrade the nation’s roads, bridges, locks and dams, and expand high-speed broadband internet service to rural and urban areas.” [Quad-City Times, 1/3/21]

**September 2020: Miller-Meeks Said Her Top Priority In Office Would Be An Infrastructure Bill, Assuming The Pandemic Would Be Under Control When She Entered Office.** “GOP congressional candidate Mariannette Miller-Meeks on Thursday said her top priority would be an infrastructure bill, assuming the coronavirus pandemic is under control before she would take office in January. ‘We really need a big infrastructure bill,’ Miller-Meeks told the Greater Des Moines Partnership. ‘I had expected it before this. I know President Trump had talked about it when he was campaigning.’” [Iowa Capital Dispatch, 9/10/20]

**November 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Infrastructure Investment And Jobs Act, Providing $550 Billion In New Infrastructure Spending And Creating Millions Of Jobs**

*November 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Infrastructure Investment And Jobs Act, Providing $550 Billion In New Infrastructure Spending.* In November 2021 Miller-Meeks voted against: “DeFazio, D-Ore., motion to concur in the Senate amendment to the bill that would provide approximately $550 billion in new infrastructure spending, including for surface transportation, broadband, water and energy infrastructure. In supplemental appropriations and increased contract authority, the bill would provide $110 billion for roads, bridges and major surface transportation projects, including $47.3 for highway infrastructure and $40 billion for bridge construction and repair; $66 billion for rail, including $58 billion for Amtrak; and $39 billion for transit, including $5.3 billion for zero- and low-emission transit buses and $2 billion for accessibility improvements. It would provide $25 billion for airports and approximately $17 billion for ports and waterways, including $3.4 billion to modernize land ports of entry and $2.25 billion for water port upgrades, including resilience and electrification projects. It would provide approximately $11 billion for various transportation safety and research programs. It would provide $7.5 billion for electric vehicle charging infrastructure and $5 billion for zero- and low-emission school bus programs. It would establish requirements for many new and existing surface transportation programs to consider the environmental and equity impacts of funded activities and authorize a range of transportation programs related to emissions reduction and climate change resilience. It would provide $1 billion for activities to reconnect neighborhoods by removing or remediating the effects of transportation infrastructure construction in disadvantaged and underserved communities. The bill would provide approximately $65 billion for broadband, including $42.5 billion for grants to states to increase access in unserved areas and $14.2 billion to extend a
program initially authorized in response to the coronavirus pandemic that provides stipends to help low-income families pay for internet services. It would provide approximately $62 billion for the Energy Department, including $21.5 billion for clean energy demonstration projects, $16.3 billion for energy efficiency and renewable energy programs, $8 billion for power grid resilience and other electricity projects, and $7.5 billion for fossil energy and carbon management. It would authorize or expand several programs to incentivize clean energy manufacturing, development and adoption. It would provide approximately $55 billion for water infrastructure and safety, including $30.7 billion for the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund, including $15 billion to replace lead service lines and $4 billion to address per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances and other emerging contaminants; and $12.7 billion for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund. Across various departments, the bill would provide funding for climate change response and environmental remediation, including; $11.3 billion for abandoned mine land and water reclamation projects, approximately $5.75 billion for wildfire management, $3.5 billion for the EPA hazardous substance superfund and $3.5 billion for FEMA flood mitigation. It would also provide more than $1.7 billion for cybersecurity resilience programs. The bill would include a number of provisions intended to offset spending, including by rescinding certain unobligated COVID-19 relief funding and establishing tax reporting requirements for cryptocurrency and other digital assets.” The motion was agreed to by a vote of 228-206. [H.R. 3684, Vote #369, 11/5/21; CQ, 11/5/21]

- **White House Projected The $1 Trillion Bipartisan Infrastructure Deal Would Add About 2 Million Jobs Per Year For A Decade.** “The $1 trillion infrastructure plan that now goes to President Joe Biden to sign into law has money for roads, bridges, ports, rail transit, safe water, the power grid, broadband internet and more […] The new law promises to reach almost every corner of the country. It’s a historic investment that the president has compared to the building of the transcontinental railroad and Interstate Highway System. The White House is projecting that the investments will add, on average, about 2 million jobs per year over the coming decade.” [Associated Press, 11/6/21]

- **CNN: Experts Agreed The Infrastructure Spending Was “Sorely Needed To Ensure Safe Travel” And “Efficient Transport Of Goods And Produce.”** “Congress passed a $1.2 trillion infrastructure package Friday, approving a signature part of President Joe Biden's economic agenda. It will deliver $550 billion of new federal investments in America's infrastructure over five years, touching everything from bridges and roads to the nation's broadband, water and energy systems. Experts say the money is sorely needed to ensure safe travel, as well as the efficient transport of goods and produce across the country. The nation's infrastructure system earned a C- score from the American Society of Civil Engineers earlier this year.” [CNN, 11/5/21]

- **Washington Post: Infrastructure Spending Included $16 Billion For “Major Projects That Are Too Large Or Complex For Traditional Funding Programs.”** “The $1.2 trillion infrastructure bill adopted late Friday creates a multibillion-dollar fund to spur the type of complicated, ambitious projects that have been stymied by decades of tentative investment and inattention from Washington. Modern-day equivalents of megaprojects like the Hoover Dam can benefit broad swaths of the United States, but infrastructure experts say they have often stagnated. […] Among the projects that could see a boost: the Gateway rail project, a vast plan to expand capacity for train traffic between New York and New Jersey; and a long-delayed effort to replace the outmoded Brent Spence Bridge connecting Kentucky and Ohio, which is one of the nation’s worst bottlenecks. […] The infrastructure bill includes about $16 billion for ‘major projects that are too large or complex for traditional funding programs,’ but that have big economic benefits, according to the White House.” [Washington Post, 11/6/21]

- **Bipartisan Infrastructure Deal Would Provide $110 Billion For Repairs To Highways, Bridges, And Roads.** “The bill would provide $110 billion to repair the nation’s aging highways, bridges and roads. According to the White House, 173,000 total miles or nearly 280,000 kilometers of America’s highways and major roads and 45,000 bridges are in poor condition. And the almost $40 billion for bridges is the single largest dedicated bridge investment since the construction of the national highway system, according to the Biden administration.” [Associated Press, 11/6/21]

- **Axios: The Infrastructure Bill Included $65 Billion For “Building High-Speed Internet Networks,**
Helping Low-Income Families Pay For Service And Digital Equity Programs.” “The infrastructure bill heading to President Biden's desk includes $65 billion to improve high-speed internet access and affordability. […] By the numbers: The funding is aimed towards building high-speed internet networks, helping low-income families pay for service and digital equity programs. $42.45 billion in grants to states for broadband projects, which can range from network deployment to data collection to help determine areas that lack service. $14.2 billion to provide a $30-a-month voucher to low-income Americans to pay for internet service. It will replace the current $50-a-month Emergency Broadband Benefit program, offering less money monthly, but increasing the number of those eligible. $2.75 billion for digital inclusion and equity projects, such as improving digital literacy or online skills for seniors. $2 billion each for a rural broadband construction program called ReConnect, run by USDA, and to the Tribal Broadband Connectivity Program run by the Commerce Department's National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA). $1 billion to build so-called 'middle mile' infrastructure to connect local providers to larger internet access points. $600 million for private activity bonds to finance broadband deployment projects in rural areas.” [Axios, 11/8/21]

- The Infrastructure Bill Included $1.75 Billion To Increase The Accessibility Of Transit Systems. “A $1.75 billion fund in the infrastructure package will aim to guarantee that transit stations are accessible, decades after campaigns by disability rights activists to demand lifts on buses helped to spur passage of the Americans With Disabilities Act. Almost a fifth of transit stations were not fully accessible in 2019, according to the most recent Federal Transit Administration data. […] The bill also includes language about Amtrak, requiring that a person with disabilities be appointed to the railroad’s board and mandating spending on accessibility, which Duckworth said helped show that accessibility was a national issue and not only an urban concern. About 25 million people in the United States report having a disability that limits their transportation options, and the Labor Department attributes lower rates of employment among people with disabilities, in part, to those obstacles. People with disabilities are almost twice as likely as others to use public transit to get around, according to the Transportation Department.” [Washington Post, 11/6/21]

- Bipartisan Infrastructure Deal Would Invest $44 Billion On Water And Wastewater Infrastructure, Including $15 Billion To Replace Lead Pipes And $10 Billion To Address PFAS Water Contamination. “The legislation would spend $55 billion on water and wastewater infrastructure. It has $15 billion to replace lead pipes and $10 billion to address water contamination from polyfluoroalkyl substances — chemicals that were used in the production of Teflon and have also been used in firefighting foam, water-repellent clothing and many other items.” [Associated Press, 11/6/21]

- Bipartisan Infrastructure Deal Would Invest $65 Billion To Improve The Reliability Of The Power Grid And Boost Clean Power Generation. “To protect against the power outages that have become more frequent in recent years, the bill would spend $65 billion to improve the reliability and resiliency of the power grid. It would also boost carbon capture technologies and more environmentally friendly electricity sources like clean hydrogen.” [Associated Press, 11/6/21]

- Bipartisan Infrastructure Deal Would Invest $7.5 Billion In Electrical Vehicle Charging Stations And $5 Billion In Electric And Hybrid School Buses. “The bill would spend $7.5 billion for electric vehicle charging stations, which the administration says are critical to accelerating the use of electric vehicles to curb climate change. It would also provide $5 billion for the purchase of electric school buses and hybrids, reducing reliance on school buses that run on diesel fuel.” [Associated Press, 11/6/21]

- Bipartisan Infrastructure Deal Would Invest $66 Billion In Amtrak, The Largest Federal Investment In The Service Since Its Founding. “To reduce Amtrak’s maintenance backlog, which has worsened since Superstorm Sandy nine years ago, the bill would provide $66 billion to improve the rail service’s Northeast Corridor (457 miles, 735 km), as well as other routes. It’s less than the $80 billion Biden — who famously rode Amtrak from Delaware to Washington during his time in the Senate — originally asked for, but it would be the largest federal investment in passenger rail service since Amtrak was founded 50 years ago.” [Associated Press, 11/6/21]
- **Bipartisan Infrastructure Deal Would Invest $25 Billion In Airport Improvements.** “The bill would spend $25 billion to improve runways, gates and taxiways at airports and to improve terminals. It would also improve aging air traffic control towers.” [Associated Press, 11/6/21]

- **Bipartisan Infrastructure Deal Would Be Funded Through Unspent Pandemic Relief, Unused Federal Unemployment Insurance, And An “Array Of Smaller Pots Of Money.”** “The five-year spending package would be paid for by tapping $210 billion in unspent COVID-19 relief aid and $53 billion in unemployment insurance aid some states have halted, along with an array of smaller pots of money, like petroleum reserve sales and spectrum auctions for 5G services.” [Associated Press, 11/6/21]

### Miller-Meeks Called The Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill She Opposed A “Reckless Tax-And-Spend Package”

**Following Her Vote Against The Bill, Miller-Meeks Called The Bipartisan Infrastructure Deal A “Reckless Tax-And-Spend Package.”** “U.S. Rep. Marianne Miller-Meeks, R-Iowa, referred to the infrastructure bill passed by the House on Friday as a ‘reckless tax-and-spend package,’ Miller-Meeks, who represents Iowa’s Second Congressional District, voted against the $1.2 trillion bill that passed the House by a vote of 228-206. Thirteen Republicans voted with the majority while six Democrats voted against the bill. ‘I have been calling for a fully funded bipartisan bill that would improve our bridges, roads, broadband, locks, dams, broadband and electric grid,’ Miller-Meeks said Friday in a news release. ‘I will not support a bill that is directly tied to a multi-trillion dollar reckless tax-and-spend package that increases inflation and had no Republican input, even though Congress is evenly divided,’ she said. ‘We could have passed a clean infrastructure package already on a bipartisan basis like the Senate did and found reasonable ways to pay for it,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘Instead, the majority decided to play politics and hold good ideas hostage to push through their agenda in a partisan manner,’ she said.” [Quad-City Times, 11/6/21]

**Miller-Meeks Claimed She Had Been “Calling For A Fully-Funded Bipartisan Bill That Would Improve Our Bridges, Roads, Broadband, Locks, Dams, Broadband, And The Electric Grid.”** “Today, November 5th, 2021, Rep. Marianne Miller-Meeks (IA-02) released the following statement after voting NO on the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act: ‘I have been calling for a fully funded bipartisan bill that would improve our bridges, roads, broadband, locks, dams, broadband, and the electric grid. I will not support a bill that is directly tied to a multi-trillion dollar reckless tax and spend package that increases inflation and had no Republican input, even though Congress is evenly divided. We could have passed a clean infrastructure package already on a bipartisan basis like the Senate did and found reasonable ways to pay for it. Instead, the majority decided to play politics and hold good ideas hostage to push through their agenda in a partisan manner.’” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 11/5/21]

### Local Opinion Writers Criticized Miller-Meeks’ “Political Calculation” In Voting Against The Bill

**The Cedar Rapids Gazette Editorial Board Was “Disappointed” That Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill Because “Contrary To Those GOP Talking Points, This Is ‘Real Infrastructure.’”** “We were disappointed to see the large majority of Republicans in Congress voted against the bill, including all three of Iowa’s GOP House members and one of our GOP senators. ‘The need to make meaningful investments in our nation’s real infrastructure — roads and bridges, locks and dams, and broadband — was sacrificed to advance a partisan, socialist spending spree,’ U.S. Rep. Ashley Hinson said in a news release. Contrary to those GOP talking points, this is ‘real infrastructure.’ Most of the funding in the $1.2 trillion package reflects the so-called spending baseline, meaning it’s money federal bureaucrats already planned to spend on basic infrastructure such as highways that would expire without an extension.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, Editorial, 11/12/21]

**Cedar Rapids Gazette’s Todd Dorman: Miller-Meeks “Voted Against A Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill That Will Bring Billions Of Dollars To The State For Highways, Bridges, Water Infrastructure And Other Needs.”** “So Eastern Iowa’s Republican members of Congress, 1st District Rep. Ashley Hinson and 2nd District
Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, voted against a bipartisan infrastructure bill that will bring billions of dollars to the state for highways, bridges, water infrastructure and other needs.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, Todd Dorman, 11/14/21]

Cedar Rapids Gazette’s Todd Dorman: Hinson And Miller-Meeks “Should Have Voted For The Infrastructure Bill” But “Decided To Make A Political Calculation” Because “Denying Democrats A Win Was More Important Than Delivering For Their Districts.”  “Hinson and Miller-Meeks should have voted for the infrastructure bill. It’s popular, bipartisan and makes needed investments in Iowa. Instead, they decided to make a political calculation that would keep them in good standing in the Trump GOP. Denying Democrats a win was more important than delivering for their districts. It’s sad, but hardly surprising.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, Todd Dorman, 11/14/21]

PolitiFact Iowa: Despite Voting Against The Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill When It Reached The House, Miller-Meeks Had Said She Supported The Original Senate-Passed Infrastructure Bill

PolitiFact Iowa: “While Miller-Meeks Said She Supported The Original Senate-Passed Infrastructure Bill, She Still Cast Her No Vote” On The Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill. “Dave Loebback wrote on his existing Twitter account that Hinson and Miller-Meeks denied rural Iowans broadband by voting no on the infrastructure bill. That happened in this instance. And, while Miller-Meeks said she supported the original Senate-passed infrastructure bill, she still cast her no vote on the bill before her.” [PolitiFact Iowa, 11/22/21]

Associated Press: The Infrastructure Investment And Jobs Act “Would Pour More Than $100 Million In Federal Money To Repair And Replace Bridges Into Southwest Iowa”

Associated Press: Miller-Meeks “Voted Against A Bill That Would Pour More Than $100 Million In Federal Money To Repair And Replace Bridges Into Southwest Iowa.” “Davenport’s 81-year-old Centennial Bridge across the Mississippi River creaks under the weight of tens of thousands of cars and trucks every day. Rust shows through its chipped silver paint, exposing the steel that needs replacing. This city’s aging landmark is among more than 1,000 structurally deficient bridges in the area. The tally gives Iowa’s 2nd congressional district the dubious distinction of having the second-most troubled bridges in the country. So, it struck some Iowans as strange when the district’s Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks voted against a bill that would pour more than $100 million in federal money to repair and replace bridges into southwest Iowa. Miller-Meeks objected to majority Democrats’ handling of the bill, never mentioning its contents, a common refrain from the minority that overwhelmingly opposed it.” [Associated Press, 12/23/21]

2021: Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District Had The Second-Most Troubled Bridges In The Country, Including Key Bridges Connecting The Quad Cities And A Bridge Linking A Key Freight Route

Associated Press: Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District Had The Second-Most Troubled Bridges In The Country Of Any District. “Davenport’s 81-year-old Centennial Bridge across the Mississippi River creaks under the weight of tens of thousands of cars and trucks every day. Rust shows through its chipped silver paint, exposing the steel that needs replacing. This city’s aging landmark is among more than 1,000 structurally deficient bridges in the area. The tally gives Iowa’s 2nd congressional district the dubious distinction of having the second-most troubled bridges in the country. So, it struck some Iowans as strange when the district’s Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks voted against a bill that would pour more than $100 million in federal money to repair and replace bridges into southwest Iowa.” [Associated Press, 12/23/21]

1,064 Bridges In Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District, Including Those Connecting The Quad Cities And Linking A Key Freight Route, Have Been Diagnosed As “Structurally Deficient.” “Miller-Meek had previously asked for money to improve Mississippi River infrastructure. She was among 38 House members from Mississippi River states who wrote to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers on Dec. 9 asking it to prioritize $2.5 billion for modernizing locks and dams. The American Road and Transportation Builders Association diagnosed 1,064 of the bridges — 20% — in Iowa’s agricultural and industrial 2nd district as structurally deficient. That is, provisionally
safe but with chronic repair needs. Two of them, including Davenport’s Centennial, cross the Mississippi in the Quad Cities, a mid-sized, industrial metro area of about 475,000 people. The bridges lace Davenport and Bettendorf, Iowa, and Rock Island and Moline, Illinois, a national crossroads of river, rail and highway commerce struggling to maintain its status as a farm machinery hub. Behind Centennial as the most traveled structurally deficient bridge is the 50-year-old Mississippi crossing on Interstate 280, a Davenport bypass that links to Interstate 80, one of the nation’s busiest freight routes.” [Associated Press, 12/23/21]

Associated Press: The President Of The Quad Cities Chamber Of Commerce Had Lobbied Miller-Meeks To Support The Infrastructure Bill Following A June 2021 Bridge Closure That Caused Traffic Blockages. “Paul Rumler, president of the Quad Cities Chamber of Commerce, lobbied Miller-Meeks to support the infrastructure bill. Commerce slows dramatically during the annual repairs on multiple bridges, he said. In June, the Interstate 280 bridge and the 55-year-old Interstate 80 bridge up river near Davenport were partially closed for repair, pushing westbound traffic back into Illinois for miles. ‘Having a long-term predictable federal infusion of funding is helpful so that we can get out of this day-to-day maintenance and think about long-term needs,’ Rumler said. ‘And the Quad Cities is certainly one of those places that has long-term needs.’” [Associated Press, 12/23/21]


Associated Press: In Opposing The Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill, Miller-Meeks “Objected To Majority Democrats’ Handling Of The Bill, Never Mentioning Its Contents.” “So, it struck some Iowans as strange when the district’s Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks voted against a bill that would pour more than $100 million in federal money to repair and replace bridges into southwest Iowa. Miller-Meeks objected to majority Democrats’ handling of the bill, never mentioning its contents, a common refrain from the minority that overwhelmingly opposed it.” [Associated Press, 12/23/21]

Associated Press: Miller-Meeks And Other Republicans “Prioritize[d] Their Party’s Line Over District Needs” In The Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill. “So, it struck some Iowans as strange when the district’s Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks voted against a bill that would pour more than $100 million in federal money to repair and replace bridges into southwest Iowa. Miller-Meeks objected to majority Democrats’ handling of the bill, never mentioning its contents, a common refrain from the minority that overwhelmingly opposed it. If anyone in Iowa was surprised that the Republican would oppose money for a glaring local priority, few in Washington were. Strategists and onetime party leaders note it’s become so common for lawmakers to prioritize their party’s line over district needs that it’s hardly mentioned.” [Associated Press, 12/23/21]

Former NRCC Chair Tom Reynolds Said Miller-Meeks Used “A Company Line” By Tying Her Vote On The Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill To The Build Back Better Act. “‘I will not support a bill that is directly tied to a multi-trillion dollar reckless tax and spend package,’ she said in the statement. Miller-Meeks and others are offering the procedural explanation, when really they are following the national trend of party loyalty, demonstrating the shift from the time-honored politics of bringing home the bacon, GOP observers said. ‘That’s a company line, as I would call it. I’ve seen that by others,’ said former New York Rep. Tom Reynolds, a former chairman of the National Republican Congressional Committee. ‘Things have changed. It used to be ‘I brought back a number of things for my district.’’” [Associated Press, 12/23/21]

December 2021: Miller-Meeks Joined A Letter Asking For Funds From The Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill To Be Allocated To River Locks And Dams In Iowa

After Voting Against The Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill, Miller-Meeks Signed A Letter Calling On The Army Corps Of Engineers To Prioritize Lock And Dam Upgrades In Utilizing Funding From The Bill. “U.S. Sen. Charles, R-Iowa, joined Sen. Dick Durbin, D-Ill., and U.S. Reps. Cheri Bustos, D-Moline, and Ashley Hinson, R-Marion, in writing a letter calling on the Corps of Engineers to prioritize funding of lock and dam upgrades on the Upper Mississippi and Illinois rivers utilizing $2.5 billion set aside for inland waterways provided in the new

- **Miller-Meeks Had Voted Against The Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill That Provided The Funding Requested In The Letter.** “So, it struck some Iowans as strange when the district’s Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks voted against a bill that would pour more than $100 million in federal money to repair and replace bridges into southwest Iowa. Miller-Meeks objected to majority Democrats’ handling of the bill, never mentioning its contents, a common refrain from the minority that overwhelmingly opposed it. […] Miller-Meeks [sic] had previously asked for money to improve Mississippi River infrastructure. She was among 38 House members from Mississippi River states who wrote to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers on Dec. 9 asking it to prioritize $2.5 billion for modernizing locks and dams. The American Road and Transportation Builders Association diagnosed 1,064 of the bridges — 20% — in Iowa’s agricultural and industrial 2nd district as structurally deficient. That is, provisionally safe but with chronic repair needs.” [Associated Press, 12/23/21]

**Miller-Meeks Voted Against The INVEST In America Act That Included More Than $15 Million For Projects In Her District, Including Those She Had Requested Funding For**

**Miller-Meeks Voted Against The INVEST In America Act, Which Would Authorize More Than $720 Billion In Surface Transportation And Water Infrastructure Projects, Calling It Too Costly**

Miller-Meeks Voted Against The INVEST In America Act, Containing More Than $720 Billion In Surface Transportation And Water Infrastructure Spending. In July 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against: “Passage of the bill, as amended, that would authorize more than $720 billion in surface transportation and water infrastructure spending. It would reauthorize federal-aid highway, public transit, rail, and surface transportation safety and research programs for five years, through fiscal 2026, and reauthorize various water infrastructure programs for five or ten years. As amended, the bill would additionally authorize more than $36 billion through fiscal 2026 for activities related to electric vehicle infrastructure, access and manufacturing. It would authorize more than $548 billion through fiscal 2026 for federal surface transportation programs, including $333 billion for federal-aid highway programs; $109 billion for transit programs; and $96 billion for rail programs. It would establish requirements for many new and existing surface transportation programs to consider the environmental and equity impacts of funded activities. It would require the Transportation Department to establish a number of grant programs for project-level investments, including for carbon pollution reduction projects to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from the surface transportation system; development of electric vehicle charging and hydrogen fueling infrastructure; separation or elimination of highway-rail crossings; extreme weather resilience and mitigation improvements; activities to reconnect neighborhoods by removing or remediating the effects of transportation infrastructure construction in disadvantaged and underserved communities. It would authorize $12 billion for a new program to support large highway, transit, and rail projects of national and regional significance. It would modify a transit grant program to require the procurement of zero-emission buses and other vehicles. Within the total for rail funding, it would authorize $32 billion for Amtra; $25 billion for a new program to fund improvements to major intercity passenger rail bridges, stations, and tunnels grant; $7 billion for passenger and freight rail infrastructure and safety improvement grants; and up to $20 million annually to establish a university innovation institute to research and develop low- and zero-emission rail technologies. It would establish an independent nonprofit known as the Clean Energy and Sustainability Accelerator to facilitate the deployment of emissions reduction technologies, requiring the Energy Department to transfer $50 billion to the accelerator upon establishment and $10 billion annually for the subsequent five years. The bill would authorize more than $117.5 billion for drinking water infrastructure and $54.4 billion for wastewater treatment infrastructure over ten years. It would authorize $53 billion through 2031 for the EPA Drinking Water State Revolving Fund, which provides grants to states to provide loans and other financial assistance to public water systems, and increase the maximum percentage of such funding states may use to assist disadvantaged communities. It would authorize $4.5 billion annually through fiscal 2031 for grants to states to replace lead service lines; $4 billion available until expended for a low-income drinking water assistance program. It would authorize $40 billion through fiscal 2026 for the EPA Clean Water State Revolving
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Fund, which provides grants to states to provide loans and other financial assistance related to water treatment infrastructure projects. It would authorize $4 billion for a low-income wastewater assistance program, available until expended. It would authorize $2.6 billion to improve water sanitation facilities funded by the Indian Health Service. It would authorize $500 million annually through fiscal 2031 for community water system PFAS treatment grants. It would require the EPA to set national primary drinking water regulations for contaminants including per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances, microcystin toxin, chromium-6 and 1,4-dioxane.” The bill passed 221 to 201. [HR 3684, Vote #208, 7/1/21; CQ, 7/1/21]

Miller-Meeks Called The INVEST In America Act Too Costly. “Republicans, including Miller-Meeks, complained the overarching legislation was too costly, unpaid for and would drive up deficits. ‘(I)t would continue to drive both our deficit and inflation,’ Miller-Meeks said in an interview Friday, arguing the bill lacked details about spending cuts, or ‘pay-fors,’ to account for the new spending and ignored input from House Republicans. ‘Successful legislat[ing] requires partnership, not partisanship. And I'll continue to work in that vein.’” [Quad-City Times, 7/2/21]

Miller-Meeks Wrote An Op-Ed Touting The “Opportunity To Invest In Infrastructure We Have Long Known Was In Need Of Repair” Days After Voting Against Infrastructure Funding

Miller-Meeks Op-Ed: Getting The Nation Back To Work After COVID-19 Was “Also An Opportunity To Invest In Infrastructure We Have Long Known Was In Need Of Repair.” “Iowans have reason to be optimistic. The state and the country are getting back to business, but the reality is the COVID-19 pandemic scarred our economy. Although Iowa businesses are challenged by a lack of workers, nationwide too many people continue to struggle with unemployment. In order to get our economy running at full capacity, it is important we get the nation back to work. It’s also an opportunity to invest in infrastructure we have long known was in need of repair.” [Ottumwa Courier, Mariannette Miller-Meeks Op-Ed, 7/6/21]

The INVEST In America Act Included More Than $15 Million For Projects In Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District, Many Of Which She Requested Funds For Herself

Quad-City Times: Miller-Meeks Voted Against An Infrastructure Deal That Included More Than $15 Million For Projects In Her District. “Iowa freshman U.S Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks on Thursday joined fellow House Republicans in voting against a $759 billion infrastructure bill, despite the measure including more than $15 million for trail and road projects in Iowa’s 2nd congressional district.” [Quad-City Times, 7/2/21]

HEADLINE: “Miller-Meeks Votes Against Infrastructure Bill With Earmarks For Iowa's 2nd District.” [Quad-City Times, 7/2/21]

Miller-Meeks’ Requested Projects Included Funds For Work On Roads, A Regional Transit Facility, And A Bridge Replacement. “The bill designates more than 1,470 projects amounting to nearly $5.7 billion in spending, according to the U.S. House Transportation & Infrastructure Committee. Nearly 1,070 projects worth just under $4 billion were sought by Democrats. Republicans secured 403 projects valued at nearly $1.7 billion. Projects requested by Miller-Meeks included in the House-passed measure include: $9.9 million for the City of Iowa City, on Dodge Street, from Burlington Street north to Governor Street; $2.3 million for the HIRTA Regional Transit Facility in Waukee; $2 million for the Marion County Road G28 corridor; $1.1 million for the Iowa 136 bridge replacement over Elwood Creek 3.1 miles west of US 61 in Clinton County; $900,000 for the Red Rock Prairie Trail in Prairie City. Miller-Meeks said she is supportive of the Iowa projects included in the bill and hopes they will become part of a larger bipartisan infrastructure bill. ‘I continue to support infrastructure,’ Miller-Meeks said, noting she voted against Republican amendments that would have ‘decimated Amtrak,’ which runs through her district. ‘And I'll continue to work on that framework for common-sense projects that can be funded and can be paid for. ... We can work in a bipartisan way. We see that happening in the Senate, and we hope to have similar things continue to happen in the House.’” [Quad-City Times, 7/2/21]

HEADLINE: “Miller-Meeks Votes Against Local Projects She Requested Funds For.” [Iowa Starting Line,
The House’s Surface Transportation Bill Including $15 Million For Trails And Roads In Miller-Meeks’ District. “Lawmakers will vote on a $715 billion surface transportation infrastructure bill (separate from the plan Biden just negotiated with Senate Republicans). Tucked inside are hundreds of millions of dollars in goodies sought by House Republicans in the form of earmarks, which were revived by House leaders this year after a yearslong ban. […] Roughly half of 22 Republicans in districts being targeted by House Democrats in the midterms requested and received earmarks in the package. They include $20 million each for roads in DAVID VALADAO’S California and DON BACON’S Nebraska districts; $15 million for trails and roads in MARIANNETTE MILLER-MEEKS’ Iowa district; and $19.4 million for JOHN KATKO (N.Y.). and $4 million each for CARLOS GIMENEZ (Fla.).” [Politico Playbook, 7/1/21]

Miller-Meeks Voted Against Her Own Earmarks

2021: Miller-Meeks Requested A Total Of $36,650,000 In Earmarks

2021: Miller-Meeks Requested A Total Of $36,650,000 In Earmarks For Her District. [Miller-Meeks Community Project Funding website, accessed 12/21/21]

Eight Of Miller-Meeks’ Community Project Funding Requests Totaling $32,900,000 Were Included In A Group Of Appropriations Bills She Voted Against


Miller-Meeks Voted Against H.R. 4502. [H.R. 4502, Vote 247, 7/29/21]

$2 Million Was Approved For Miller-Meeks’ Community Project Funding Request For Indian Hills Community College In The LHHS Subcommittee Appropriations Bill

Miller-Meeks Requested $5 Million In Community Project Funding For Indian Hills Community College. “Proposed recipient: Indian Hills Community College Recipient address: 525 Grandview Avenue, Ottumwa IA 52501 Requested amount: $5,000,000” [Office Of Rep. Miller-Meeks, Accessed 7/30/21]

• $2 Million In Community Project Funding Was Approved For Indian Hills Community College In The Labor, Health And Human Services, Education, And Related Agencies Subcommittee Appropriations Bill. [House Appropriations Committee, Accessed 7/30/21]

Miller-Meeks’ Two Approved Sewer Project Requests Totaled $4.2 Million

Miller-Meeks Requested $1.7 Million In Community Project Funding For The City Of Burlington’s Sewer Separation Project. “Proposed recipient: City of Burlington Recipient address: 400 Washington Street, Burlington, IA 52601 Requested amount: $1,700,000 Explanation of request: The requested funds will allow the City of Burlington to complete additional sewer separation and road work.” [Office Of Rep. Miller-Meeks, Accessed 7/30/21]

• $1.7 Million In Community Project Funding Was Approved For The City Of Burlington’s Sewer
Miller-Meeks Requested $2.5 Million In Community Project Funding For The City Of Ottumwa’s Blake’s Branch Sewer Project. “Proposed recipient: City of Ottumwa Recipient address: 105 East Third Street, Ottumwa, IA 52501 Requested amount: $2,500,000 Explanation of request: The Blake’s Branch Sewer project is a piece of the City of Ottumwa’s continued efforts to meet federal and state mandates to remedy the Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) throughout the City.” [Office Of Rep. Miller-Meeks, Accessed 7/30/21]

- $2.5 Million In Community Project Funding Was Approved For The City Of Ottumwa’s Blake’s Branch Sewer Project In The Interior, Environment, And Related Agencies Subcommittee Appropriations Bill. [House Appropriations Committee, Accessed 7/30/21]

Miller-Meeks’ Four Approved Transportation And Housing And Urban Development Requests, Including Highway Construction And Bridge Replacement Projects, Toted $4.2 Million

Miller-Meeks Requested $1 Million For The Reconstruction Of Iowa Highway 38 In Tipton. “Proposed recipient: City of Tipton Recipient address: City Hall, 407 Lynn Street, Tipton, IA 52772 Requested amount: $1,000,000 Explanation of request: The project request is for the first two of three phases of the reconstruction of Iowa Highway 38, which is also known as Cedar Street. This is Tipton’s ‘Main Street.’” [Office Of Rep. Miller-Meeks, Accessed 7/30/21]

- $2 Million In Community Project Funding Was Approved For The Reconstruction Of Iowa Highway 38 In Tipton In The Transportation, Housing And Urban Development, And Related Agencies Subcommittee Appropriations Bill. [House Appropriations Committee, Accessed 7/30/21]

Miller-Meeks Requested $850,000 For The Mahaska/Oskaloosa Driving Economic Success (MODES) Planning Study. “Proposed recipient: Mahaska County Recipient address: 2074 Old Highway 163 Oskaloosa, Iowa 52577 Requested amount: $850,000 Explanation of request: The City of Oskaloosa, with the support of Mahaska County, seek Community Project Funding from Congress to help fund the public-private project, dubbed Mahaska/Oskaloosa Driving Economic Success (MODES) Planning and Environment Linkages (PEL) study and a streamlined Environmental Assessment (EA) for a new roadway that will provide improved regional and local access in rural east central Iowa.” [Office Of Rep. Miller-Meeks, Accessed 7/30/21]

- $850,000 In Community Project Funding Was Approved For The MODES Planning Study In The Transportation, Housing And Urban Development, And Related Agencies Subcommittee Appropriations Bill. [House Appropriations Committee, Accessed 7/30/21]

Miller-Meeks Requested $600,000 For The Scott County Bridge Replacement Project. “Proposed recipient: Scott County Secondary Roads Department Recipient address: 950 E. Blackhawk Trail, Eldridge, Iowa 52748 Requested amount: $600,000 Explanation of request: The Scott County Secondary Roads Department seeks Community Project Funding from Congress for a bridge replacement project located at 250 feet northeast of 18378 Wells Ferry Road, Pleasant Valley, IA 52767.This bridge is on the National Bridge Inspection system and considered structurally deficient.” [Office Of Rep. Miller-Meeks, Accessed 7/30/21]

- $600,000 In Community Project Funding Was Approved For The Scott County Bridge Replacement Project In The Transportation, Housing And Urban Development, And Related Agencies Subcommittee Appropriations Bill. [House Appropriations Committee, Accessed 7/30/21]

Miller-Meeks Requested $750,000 For The Iowa City Transit Operations And Maintenance Facility. “Proposed recipient: Iowa City Transit/City of Iowa City Recipient address: 410 E Washington Street, Iowa City, IA 52240 Requested amount: $750,000 Explanation of request: Community Project Funding is requested for
• $750,000 In Community Project Funding Was Approved For The Iowa City Transit Operations And Maintenance Facility In The Transportation, Housing And Urban Development, And Related Agencies Subcommittee Appropriations Bill. [House Appropriations Committee, Accessed 7/30/21]

Miller-Meeks’ Approved Energy And Water Development Request Was $22.5 Million For The Upper Mississippi River Navigation And Ecosystem Sustainability Program

Recipient address: 1500 Rock Island Dr, Rock Island, IL 61201
Requested amount: $22,500,000

The Upper Mississippi River NESP Funding Was Included In The Energy And Water Development Subcommittee Appropriations Bill. “It is those last two connections the pair celebrated last week with news that their bipartisan request for $22.5 million for lock and dam — as well as environmental — renovations on the Mississippi River had passed the Appropriations Committee as part of the 2021 funding bill for Energy and Water Development. The project would breathe life into the Upper Mississippi River Navigation and Ecosystem Sustainability Program, which had sat stagnant for years. […] ‘This is absolutely a crucial issue for our river economies,’ said Hinson during her weekly call with Iowa press on Friday. ‘This is about safety, expediency, efficiency and making sure we have viable ways to get our products to market. The entire country is dependent upon the river economy of the Mississippi River. It’s a huge win for the Midwest, specifically Iowa’s farmers and ag producers.’” [Telegraph Herald, 7/18/21]

Jan. 2021: Miller-Meeks Tweeted About “The Importance Of Passing A Much Needed Infrastructure Bill To Rebuild/Enhance Our Infrastructure On The Mississippi River.” “An informative tour of Lock 14 in Pleasant Valley alongside @MikeNaigIA this Friday afternoon. It showcases the importance of passing a much needed infrastructure bill to rebuild/enhance our infrastructure on the Mississippi River. Thank you for having us! #ia02” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 1/29/21]

Miller-Meeks Voted Against Infrastructure Funding She Requested For Her District Days Before Writing An Op-Ed Touting The “Opportunity To Invest In Infrastructure We Have Long Known Was In Need Of Repair”

HEADLINE: “Miller-Meeks Votes Against Infrastructure Bill With Earmarks For Iowa's 2nd District.” [Quad-City Times, 7/2/21]

Miller-Meeks Voted Against An Infrastructure Deal That Included More Than $15 Million For Projects In Her District. “Iowa freshman U.S Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks on Thursday joined fellow House Republicans in voting against a $759 billion infrastructure bill, despite the measure including more than $15 million for trail and road projects in Iowa’s 2nd congressional district.” [Quad-City Times, 7/2/21]

Miller-Meeks Op-Ed: Getting The Nation Back To Work After COVID-19 Was “Also An Opportunity To Invest In Infrastructure We Have Long Known Was In Need Of Repair.” “Iowans have reason to be optimistic. The state and the country are getting back to business, but the reality is the COVID-19 pandemic scarred our economy. Although Iowa businesses are challenged by a lack of workers, nationwide too many people continue to struggle with unemployment. In order to get our economy running at full capacity, it is important we get the
nation back to work. It’s also an opportunity to invest in infrastructure we have long known was in need of repair.” [Ottumwa Courier, Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 7/6/21]

**Rural Broadband**

State Sen. Joe Bolkcom Op-Ed: Miller-Meeks “Voted Against Rural Iowa Communities And Farmers” By Opposing Funding For Rural Broadband, Bridges, And Water Systems

State Sen. Joe Bolkcom Op-Ed: Miller-Meeks “Voted Against Rural Iowa Communities And Farmers” By Opposing “Generational Funding For Rural Internet, Roads, Bridges And Water Systems.” “Just recently, federal Republicans Joni Ernst, Randy Feenstra, Ashley Hinson and Mariannette Miller-Meeks all voted against rural Iowa communities and farmers when they voted no on generational funding for rural internet, roads, bridges and water systems. Democrats passed the infrastructure bill that will bring blue state money to fix our dilapidated red state infrastructure. What are they thinking?” [Quad-City Times, Joe Bolkcom, 12/12/21]

**Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Bipartisan Infrastructure Deal That Included An Investment Of $65 Billion In Broadband Access For Rural Areas, Low-Income Families, And Tribal Communities**

November 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Infrastructure Investment And Jobs Act, Providing $550 Billion In New Infrastructure Spending. In November 2021 Miller-Meeks voted against: “DeFazio, D-Ore., motion to concur in the Senate amendment to the bill that would provide approximately $550 billion in new infrastructure spending, including for surface transportation, broadband, water and energy infrastructure. In supplemental appropriations and increased contract authority, the bill would provide $110 billion for roads, bridges and major surface transportation projects, including $47.3 for highway infrastructure and $40 billion for bridge construction and repair; $66 billion for rail, including $58 billion for Amtrak; and $39 billion for transit, including $5.3 billion for zero- and low-emission transit buses and $2 billion for accessibility improvements. It would provide $25 billion for airports and approximately $17 billion for ports and waterways, including $3.4 billion to modernize land ports of entry and $2.25 billion for water port upgrades, including resilience and electrification projects. It would provide approximately $11 billion for various transportation safety and research programs. It would provide $7.5 billion for electric vehicle charging infrastructure and $5 billion for zero- and low-emission school bus programs. It would establish requirements for many new and existing surface transportation programs to consider the environmental and equity impacts of funded activities and authorize a range of transportation programs related to emissions reduction and climate change resilience. It would provide $1 billion for activities to reconnect neighborhoods by removing or remediating the effects of transportation infrastructure construction in disadvantaged and underserved communities. The bill would provide approximately $65 billion for broadband, including $42.5 billion for grants to states to increase access in unserved areas and $14.2 billion to extend a program initially authorized in response to the coronavirus pandemic that provides stipends to help low-income families pay for internet services. It would provide approximately $62 billion for the Energy Department, including $21.5 billion for clean energy demonstration projects, $16.3 billion for energy efficiency and renewable energy programs, $8 billion for power grid resilience and other electricity projects, and $7.5 billion for fossil energy and carbon management. It would authorize or expand several programs to incentivize clean energy manufacturing, development and adoption. It would provide approximately $55 billion for water infrastructure and safety, including $30.7 billion for the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund, including $15 billion to replace lead service lines and $4 billion to address per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances and other emerging contaminants; and $12.7 billion for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund. Across various departments, the bill would provide funding for climate change response and environmental remediation, including: $11.3 billion for abandoned mine land and water reclamation projects, approximately $5.75 billion for wildfire management, $3.5 billion for the EPA hazardous substance superfund and $3.5 billion for FEMA flood mitigation. It would also provide more than $1.7 billion for cybersecurity resilience programs. The bill would include a number of provisions intended to offset spending, including by rescinding certain unobligated COVID-19 relief funding and establishing tax reporting requirements for cryptocurrency and other digital assets.” The motion was agreed to by a vote of 228-206. [H.R. 3684, Vote #369, 11/5/21; CQ, 11/5/21]
Bipartisan Infrastructure Deal Would Invest $65 Billion In Broadband Access For Rural Areas, Low-Income Families, And Tribal Communities. “The legislation’s $65 billion for broadband access would aim to improve internet services for rural areas, low-income families and tribal communities. Most of the money would be made available through grants to states.” [Associated Press, 11/6/21]

October 2020: Miller-Meeks Said The COVID-19 Pandemic Exacerbated The Need For Expanded Rural Broadband

October 2020: Miller-Meeks Said There Was A Need To Increase Access To Rural Broadband To Support Virtual Learning, Health Care, And Work. “Miller-Meeks said the Aug. 10 derecho particularly showed a need to look at Iowa's electric infrastructure and grids to better handle another natural disaster. She also said there is a need to boost access to telehealth and strengthen insurance coverage for virtual health care, as well as to increase access to rural broadband to support virtual learning, health care and work.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 10/8/20]

2019: Miller-Meeks Voted For The Empower Rural Iowa Act, Which Incentivized Rural Broadband Access

2019: Miller-Meeks Voted For The Empower Rural Iowa Act, Which Incentivized Rural Broadband Access. Miller-Meeks voted for HF 772, “A bill for an act creating an empower rural Iowa Act to provide incentives for broadband and workforce housing, and including effective date and applicability provisions.” The bill passed 50-0. [Iowa State Legislature, HF 772, 4/24/19]

Transportation

Miller-Meeks Voted For Extending Funding For Federal Highways And Other Surface Transportation Through October 31, 2021

Miller-Meeks Voted For Extending Funding For Federal Highways And Other Surface Transportation Through October 31, 2021. In October 2021 Miller-Meeks voted for: “Passage of the bill that would extend through Oct. 31, 2021, funding and authorities for federal surface transportation programs, including highway, public transit, rail and safety and research programs that expire after Sept. 30. For the extension period, it would authorize appropriations for programs funded by the highway and mass transit accounts of the Highway Trust Fund in amounts proportional to amounts authorized for such programs in fiscal 2021. It would extend expenditure authority for the fund through Nov. 1, 2021. It would require federal employees furloughed as a result of the trust fund expenditure lapse to be paid for the period of the lapse, and it would require employees required to work during the lapse to be paid at their standard rate of pay. It would increase funding levels during the extension period for nationally significant freight and highway projects grants and in-vehicle alcohol detection device research. It would also extend for approximately one month expiring authorities for Sport Fish Restoration and Boating and Leaking Underground Storage Tank trust fund expenditures and funding for the Appalachian Regional Commission and sport fishing activities. Upon enactment of the bipartisan infrastructure package (HR 3684), it would rescind any duplicate contract authority provided by the bill.” The motion was agreed to by a vote of 365-51. [H.R. 5434, Vote #313, 10/1/21; CQ, 10/1/21]

September 2020: Miller-Meeks Said Higher Hybrid Vehicle Registration Fees Were An Option For Funding Infrastructure Projects Like Road Work Traditionally Funded By Fuel Taxes

September 2020: Miller-Meeks Said Higher Hybrid Vehicle Registration Fees Were An Option For Funding Infrastructure Projects Like Road Work Traditionally Funded By Fuel Taxes. “Miller-Meeks said the infrastructure needs are clear, but the source of cash to pay for the work is less so. ‘The question is, how do we pay for that? We know that with electric vehicles and hybrid vehicles, our road-use tax revenues have decreased,'
Miller-Meeks said. ‘Our state in fact increased its fuel tax several years ago to try to adjust and adapt for that. I would be glad to pay a higher registration fee for my hybrid vehicle to help pay’ for infrastructure projects, she added. Governments have struggled as Americans drive less, or drive more-efficient vehicles. That means they buy less fuel, and pay less taxes that traditionally have paid for road work. ‘I think we all know that our bridges, our locks on the Mississippi River, our dams, our highways’ need work, Miller-Meeks said. ‘Some of our roads in Ottumwa are terrible.’ Congress needs to pass an infrastructure bill covering five to 10 years of projects, possibly paid for by an increase in the federal fuel tax, Miller-Meeks said. At the same time, the federal government should back research into how to make roads last longer, she added.” [Iowa Capital Dispatch, 9/10/20]

**2014: Miller-Meeks Said She Favored Upgrading Infrastructure, Widening Freeways And Enacting A Long-Term Transportation Law**

2014: Miller-Meeks also told the Rotary Club that Iowa’s infrastructure needs upgrading, saying that she favors widening U.S. 30 and U.S. 34 to four lanes across the state. She also said the country needs a long-term transportation law. Lately, Congress has been extending previous laws on a short-term basis, mostly because Republicans and Democrats have not been able to agree on how to pay for a long-range plan.” [Globe Gazette, 9/30/14]

**Public Construction Contracts**

**2020: Miller-Meeks Voted To Limit Options In Iowa For Public Construction Contracts**

2020: Miller-Meeks voted for SF 2364, “A bill for an act relating to a construction manager-at-risk commercial construction alternative delivery method and prohibiting certain other alternative delivery methods in the public sector and including effective date and applicability provisions.” The bill passed 29-20. [Iowa State Legislature, SF 2364, 6/4/20]

- **SF 2364 Prohibited Design-Build Contracts For Construction Of Public Improvements.** “Prohibited contracts. 1. Notwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary, a governmental entity shall not be authorized to enter into a design-build contract for the construction of a public improvement. For purposes of this subsection, ‘design-build contract’ means a single contract providing for both design services and construction services that may include maintenance, operations, preconstruction, and other related services.” [Iowa State Legislature, SF 2364, 6/4/20]
**Significant Findings**

- Miller-Meeks did not deliver on her campaign promises to extend unemployment insurance.
  - October 2020: Miller-Meeks said Congress needed to act quickly to provide more COVID-19 relief, including expanded pandemic unemployment insurance (UI).
  - June 2021: Miller-Meeks criticized pandemic UI for burdening workforce participation, claiming 40% of Iowa workers on pandemic UI made more than they previously did in wages.
  - May 2021: Miller-Meeks supported Gov. Kim Reynolds’ decision to end Iowa’s participation in pandemic UI.

- Miller-Meeks not only opposed a $15/hour minimum wage but even opposed the concept of a single federal minimum wage.
  - February 2021: Miller-Meeks said she voted against the budget resolution that advanced ARP because she opposed “partisan issues such as a national $15/hour minimum wage” Democrats included in it.
  - February 2021: Miller-Meeks said “the cost of living varies too much between states to mandate a blanket federal minimum wage” and that a federal policy would hurt Iowans.
  - September 2020: Miller-Meeks said the minimum wage was “not supposed to be a wage or was not meant to be a wage that is supposed to support a family.”
  - 2014: Miller-Meeks declined to state a position on the minimum wage.

- March 2021: Miller-Meeks voted against the Protecting the Right to Organize (PRO) Act, a bill protecting and expanding workers’ collective bargaining rights; she called it a “gift to union bosses.”

- 2021: Miller-Meeks said she was glad that John Deere and UAW reached a deal, ending the John Deere strike.

- 2015: Miller-Meeks supported right to work legislation, saying it would help create jobs.

- April 2021: Miller-Meeks voted against requiring health care and social service industry employers to implement comprehensive workplace violence prevention plans.

- 2019: Miller-Meeks voted for a bill narrowing the range of workplace injuries eligible for workers’ compensation.

- January 2021: Miller-Meeks said that prior to COVID-19, Trump’s policies “created an unparalleled economic boom with expansive job growth and wage increases.”
October 2020: Miller-Meeks Said Congress Needed To Act Quickly To Provide More COVID-19 Relief, Including Unemployment Benefits. “Miller-Meeks, in last week's Quad-City Times/KWQC TV6 debate, agreed that Congress needs to act quickly on a bipartisan solution to provide another wave of coronavirus relief, including additional unemployment benefits. On immigration reform, Hart said she supports a strong southern border, but that Congress must craft humanitarian immigration reform that recognizes immigrants are an important part of growing Iowa's economy and filling workforce gaps.” [Quad-City Times, 10/22/20]

October 2020: Miller-Meeks Said Another COVID-19 Economic Relief Bill Should Facilitate SNAP Benefits, Additional PPP Funds, And Address Unemployment. “As the debate largely centered on the pandemic, the two agreed that Congress should take swift action to reach bipartisan solutions. Negotiations on more government aid have stalled in Congress as President Donald Trump waffles on pressing the legislative branch to pass a relief package. Trump had tweeted Tuesday that he ‘instructed my representatives to stop negotiating until after the election,’ though hours later, he urged Congress to pass a new relief bill. […] Miller-Meeks agreed that the hiatus in negotiations over another relief package was ‘disappointing,’ especially seeing firsthand the struggling individuals and small businesses in her town. Another bill should provide additional Paycheck Protection Program funds, address unemployment and facilitate Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program benefits - popularly known as food stamps - to help those with food insecurity. Miller-Meeks said. She touted Iowa's 'conservative fiscal practices’ as helping the state better brace for the pandemic than other states, taking aim at three states under Democratic control. ‘You can't expect the taxpayers of Iowa to bailout Illinois or New York or California for their poor fiscal practices,’ Miller-Meeks said.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 10/8/20]

June 2021: Miller-Meeks Criticized Unemployment Insurance For Burdening Workforce Participation, Claiming 40% Of Workers On UI Made More Than They Had In Wages

Miller-Meeks: “Currently About 40 Percent Of Workers On Enhanced Unemployment Are Paid More Than They Did While They Were Working; Coincidentally There Is A Labor Shortage.” “MILLER-MEEKS: Thank you and currently about 40 percent of workers on enhanced unemployment are paid more than they did while they were working; coincidentally there is a labor shortage. In my home state of Iowa, as of May 2021, 87,000 workers dropped out of the labor force since February 2020, a 5 percent decrease in the size of Iowa's workforce notwithstanding employers in my state cannot find workers and these are jobs that are greater than $15 an hour; even some employers cannot find people to work at salaries of between $80,000 and $130,000. As Governor Brainard pointed out earlier this year, true unemployment is far higher than the headline rate and the labor force participation rate is nearly 6 percentage points below where it was at the beginning of the 21st century. Shouldn't we be doing everything we can to incentivize work for our citizens and shouldn't we be looking at bringing in additional unskilled workers into this country at a time when we have a labor shortage of skilled workers?” [CQ, 6/22/21]

Miller-Meeks: Federal Unemployment Enhancement Was “Creating More Of A Burden” For Workforce Participation. “Miller-Meeks also said she believes the federal unemployment enhancement, which continues in some states until September, is also keeping some from re-entering the workforce. (It ends this month in Iowa.) ‘The workforce was an issue before the pandemic. This enhancement is creating more of a burden. That’s creating a barrier, and we’re not talking about minimum wage jobs. We’re talking about $15 an hour, $30,000 a year, jobs.’” [Fort Madison Daily Democrat, 6/4/21]

May 2021: Miller-Meeks Supported Gov. Reynolds’ Decision To End Iowa’s Participation In Pandemic Unemployment Insurance

Miller-Meeks: “We Need To Get Rid Of The Pandemic Emergency Measures That Were Put In Place, And
That Were Just Passed In January, That Had Increased Enhanced Federal Unemployment Benefits.” “On the subject of the current labor shortage, Representative Miller-Meeks said. ‘Right now, we are seeing there’s a huge demand for labor. And we can’t get labor and people into the workforce. And I’m not talking about jobs that pay $7.25 an hour; I don’t even know of a job, even if that’s the federal minimum wage, I don’t know of any employer that’s paying that. They’re all paying much more than that. And to get workers at $16 to $20 an hour and even, I’ve talked to some employers, to get people to come in to jobs that are 80 to 130 thousand a year, or they’re having difficulty. So we need to get rid of the pandemic emergency measures that were put in place, and that were just passed in January, that had increased enhanced federal unemployment benefits. We need to relinquish that so we can get people back in the workplace.”’ [Oskaloosa News, 5/31/21]

May 2021: Miller-Meeks Said She “Fully Support[ed]” Gov. Reynolds’ Decision To End Iowa’s Participation In Federal Pandemic-Related Unemployment Benefits. “I fully support @IAGovernor's decision. Iowa has been leading the way for months by getting our kids back in school, reopening our businesses, and putting our economy back on track.” QUOTE TWEET @IAGovernor: “Iowa will end its participation in federal pandemic-related unemployment benefit programs. Our unemployment rate is at 3.7 percent, vaccines are available to anyone who wants one, and we have more jobs available than unemployed people. (1/2)’’ [Twitter, @RepMMM, 5/11/21]

Miller-Meeks Voted To Disqualify Marijuana Users From Unemployment Insurance During The Pandemic


- HF 2589 Disqualified Marijuana Users From Unemployment Insurance. “This Act relates to the use of medical cannabidiol and marijuana. A person is disqualified from receiving unemployment benefits if the person is separated from employment due to the use of marijuana or another controlled substance that the person was using unlawfully. Such a disqualification shall continue until the person has worked in and has been paid wages for insured work equal to 10 times the person’s weekly benefit amount.” [Iowa Legislative Services Agency, 7/20]

Miller-Meeks Opposed A Federal Minimum Wage As A Concept, And Opposed A $15/Hour Minimum Wage

February 2021: Miller-Meeks Said She Opposed The “Partisan Issues Such As A National $15/Hour Minimum Wage” Democrats Included In Their Budget Resolution Setting Up The American Rescue Plan

February 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Establishing The Congressional Budget For The United States Government For Fiscal Year 2021 And The Appropriate Budgetary Levels For Fiscal Years 2022 Through 2030. In February 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against: “Agreeing to the concurrent resolution, as amended, that would set annual budgetary levels for federal revenues, new budget authority, outlays, deficits and public debt for fiscal years 2021 through 2030, including to outline annual levels of new budget authority and outlays for each of the 20 major budget function categories. The concurrent resolution would direct 12 House committees to make recommendations within their respective jurisdictions for budget reconciliation legislation that combined could increase the deficit by up to $1.9 trillion through fiscal 2030, intended to be used as a vehicle for further COVID-19 relief. It would require the committees to report their recommendations to the House Budget Committee by Feb. 16, 2021, and specify amounts by which each committee’s recommendations could increase the total deficit, including $940.72 billion for the Ways and Means Committee, $357.08 billion for the Education and Labor Committee, $350.7 billion for the Oversight and Reform Committee and $188.5 billion for the Energy and Commerce Committee. The concurrent resolution would include two reserve funds for the House Budget Committee to revise committee allocations and other budgetary levels for budget reconciliation legislation within the deficit limits
established by the concurrent resolution, and for any other legislation that would not increase the deficit for a five-year time period through fiscal 2025 or a ten-year time period through fiscal 2030. Among other provisions, it would authorize the House and Senate Appropriations committees to receive a separate discretionary budget allocation for administrative expenses related to the Social Security Administration and the United States Postal Service, and it would continue for fiscal 2021 certain existing limitations on advance appropriations.” The resolution passed 218 to 212. [H Con Res 11, Vote #21, 2/3/21; CQ, 2/3/21]

February 2021: Miller-Meeks Claimed Democrats Pushed “Partisan Issues Such As A National $15/Hour Minimum Wage” In Their Budget Resolution Advancing The American Rescue Plan. “Iowa Republican U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks on Friday voted against a budget resolution that could clear the way for President Joe Biden's $1.9 trillion coronavirus relief package. The House passed the Senate-amended budget plan by a vote 219-209, after senators agreed to an amendment by U.S. Sen. Joni Ernst, R-Iowa, to prevent a $15 federal minimum wage hike during a global pandemic. Ernst, in a statement, said such move would kill jobs for lower-wage workers and severely burden Iowa small businesses and rural economies that are facing unprecedented challenges amidst the COVID-19 pandemic. Miller-Meeks echoed Ernst in her own statement Friday on voting against the budget resolution. ‘I am disappointed that Congressional leaders brought a partisan budget resolution to the floor costing $1.9 trillion of taxpayer dollars,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘Congress has acted in a bipartisan manner to address the pandemic, and it is unfortunate that we are choosing to use the reconciliation process instead of having an open debate on a relief package that could have an immediate impact on the lives of our constituents.’ Instead, Miller-Meeks argued Democrats pushed forward ‘partisan issues such as a national $15/hour minimum wage, which would kill thousands of jobs across the country and in southeastern Iowa, and bailouts for state governments, such as Illinois, who have mismanaged their budgets.’” [Quad-City Times, 2/5/21]

• Cedar Rapids Gazette Gave The Claim That Miller-Meeks Voted Against Sending Relief To Iowans Who Had Lost Their Jobs An “A” Grade In Its Fact Check. “Claim 3: 'But for Iowans who lost their job, she voted against sending more relief.' It references a Feb. 3 budget resolution that cleared the way for Democrats to pass Biden's COVID-19 relief bill. Biden's relief bill includes $1,400 direct payments to each tax filer and their dependents, unemployment assistance and about $350 billion in aid for local, state and tribal governments. Miller-Meeks, along with Iowa's two other Republican representatives, voted against the resolution. 'I am disappointed that Congressional leaders brought a partisan budget resolution to the floor costing $1.9 trillion of taxpayer dollars,' Miller-Meeks said. 'Congress has acted in a bipartisan manner to address the pandemic, and it is unfortunate that we are choosing to use the reconciliation process instead of having an open debate on a relief package that could have an immediate impact on the lives of our constituents.' Instead, Miller-Meeks argued Democrats pushed forward 'partisan issues such as a national $15/hour minimum wage, which would kill thousands of jobs across the country and in southeastern Iowa, and bailouts for state governments, such as Illinois, who have mismanaged their budgets.' We give this claim an A.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 3/1/21]

February 2021: Miller-Meeks Said She Opposed “A Blanket Federal Minimum Wage”

February 2021: Miller-Meeks Said “The Cost Of Living Varies Too Much Between States To Mandate A Blanket Federal Minimum Wage.” “The cost of living varies too much between states to mandate a blanket federal minimum wage. Mandating a federal minimum wage would have serious repercussions for Iowa small businesses and families. @EdLaborGOP” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 2/18/21]

February 2021: Miller-Meeks Said A “Blanket Federal Minimum Wage” Would Hurt Iowans. “The cost of living varies too much between states to mandate a blanket federal minimum wage. Mandating a federal minimum wage would have serious repercussions for Iowa small businesses and families. @EdLaborGOP” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 2/18/21]

Miller-Meeks: “I Don’t Know Of Any Employer” That’s Paying The $7.25/Hour Federal Minimum Wage, “They’re All Paying Much More Than That”
Miller-Meeks said. ‘Right now, we are seeing there’s a huge demand for labor. And we can’t get labor and people into the workforce. And I’m not talking about jobs that pay $7.25 an hour; I don’t even know of a job, even if that’s the federal minimum wage, I don’t know of any employer that’s paying that. They’re all paying much more than that.’” [Oskaloosa News, 5/31/21]

September 2020: Miller-Meeks Said The Minimum Wage Was “Not Supposed To Be A Wage Or Was Not Meant To Be A Wage That Is Supposed To Support A Family”

September 2020: Miller-Meeks Said The Minimum Wage Was “Not Supposed To Be A Wage Or Was Not Meant To Be A Wage That Is Supposed To Support A Family.” “On money matters, Republican Mariannette Miller-Meeks supports looking at raising the retirement age to ease the strain on the Social Security system. Democrat Rita Hart doesn’t. Hart wants to raise the federal minimum wage but didn’t say by how much. Miller-Meeks thinks the states should determine the minimum wage. Miller-Meeks said, ‘A minimum wage is…and I started out 30 cents an hour…so a minimum wage is an entry-level. It’s not supposed to be a wage or was not meant to be a wage that is supposed to support a family.’” [WHO 13 Des Moines, 9/25/20]

2014: Miller-Meeks Declined To State A Position On The Minimum Wage

Miller-Meeks Would Not Say If She Supported A Minimum Wage Increase, Instead Saying She Would Focus On Pro-Growth Policies. “She says fewer regulations and more market-oriented policies will produce a better economy. She doesn’t say whether she opposes an increase in the minimum wage, like many in her party. Instead, she says, the focus ought to be on creating pro-growth policies, telling a Davenport audience last month, “Why are we even talking about the minimum wage when people need to make more than the minimum wage?”’” [The Quad-City Times, 10/13/14]

2014: Miller-Meeks Declined To Oppose An Increase In The Minimum Wage. “Miller-Meeks has been critical of several federal policies, such as Affordable Care Act and other regulations, saying they are hurting the economy. But unlike many Republicans, she declined Monday to oppose an increase in the minimum wage. […] The minimum wage in Iowa is $7.25 per hour, the same as the federal figure. ‘The most important thing is what kind of jobs are we creating and do they pay more than the minimum wage, because why are we even talking about the minimum wage when people need to make more than the minimum wage,’ she said in answer to an audience question on the topic.” [Globe Gazette, 9/30/14]

Miller-Meeks Said “Why Are We Even Talking About The Minimum Wage When People Need To Make More Than The Minimum Wage”

Miller-Meeks: “T Why Are We Even Talking About The Minimum Wage When People Need To Make More Than The Minimum Wage.” “Miller-Meeks has been critical of several federal policies, such as Affordable Care Act and other regulations, saying they are hurting the economy. But unlike many Republicans, she declined Monday to oppose an increase in the minimum wage. […] The minimum wage in Iowa is $7.25 per hour, the same as the federal figure. ‘The most important thing is what kind of jobs are we creating and do they pay more than the minimum wage, because why are we even talking about the minimum wage when people need to make more than the minimum wage,’ she said in answer to an audience question on the topic.” [Globe Gazette, 9/30/14]

Unions & Organizing

March 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Protecting The Right To Organize (PRO) Act, A Bill Protecting Collective Bargaining Rights

Miller-Meeks Voted Against The PRO Act Expanding Authorities Of The National Labor Relations Board And Protecting Collective Bargaining Rights. In March 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against: “Passage of the bill,
as amended, that would expand enforcement authorities of the National Labor Relations Board and modify procedures by which employees may unionize and elect representation under federal labor law. The bill would authorize the NLRB to enforce any orders it issues and to impose a number of civil monetary penalties, including penalties of up to $50,000 against employers who prevent or punish organizing activities by employees. It would require the NLRB to seek temporary injunctions against employers charged with engaging in unfair labor practices and allow employees to bring civil action if the board fails to seek an injunction. It would outline a number of procedures by which employees may petition for and elect representation for collective bargaining through an election directed by the NLRB. It would require the NLRB to schedule pre-election hearings within eight days of a petition being filed; prohibit employers from certain interference or participation in such elections; and require the NLRB to certify and order the employer to engage in collective bargaining with an elected labor organization. It would outline procedures for initial collective bargaining between an employer and a union, including to provide for federal mediation services if an agreement is not reached 90 days after the bargaining begins and referral to an arbitration panel if an agreement is not reached in an additional 30 days. Among other provisions, the bill would prohibit employers from taking certain retaliatory actions against employees who participate in a strike, including permanently replacing or discriminating against such employees. It would specify that employees' right to strike is protected regardless of the duration, scope, frequency, or intermittence of the strike. It would modify definitions of ‘employee’ and ‘supervisor,’ particularly to narrow the classification of independent contractors and supervisors, two categories of employees not eligible for collective bargaining. It would also authorize the use of collective bargaining agreements that require employees to pay fees to a labor organization as a condition of employment.”

The bill passed by a vote of 225-206. [HR 842, Vote #70, 3/9/21; CQ, 3/9/21]

- **As Drafted In 2020, The PRO Act Would Allow The NLRB TO Fine Companies That Retaliated Against Workers Who Organized, And Would Weaken “Right To Work” Laws.** “The Protecting the Right to Organize Act, known as the PRO Act, would amend some of the country’s decades-old labor laws to give workers more power during disputes at work, add penalties for companies that retaliate against workers who organize and grant some hundreds of thousands of workers collective-bargaining rights they don’t currently have. It would also weaken ‘right-to-work’ laws in 27 states that allow employees to forgo participating in and paying dues to unions. The House passed the bill with a vote of 224 to 194, mostly along party lines.” [Washington Post, 2/6/20]

- **The Bill Would Allow More People Classified As Contractors To Be Given Employee Status.** “The bill would also allow more people currently classified as contractors to be given the status of employees for the purposes of union organizing, potentially paving the way for gig workers at companies like Lyft, Uber and DoorDash to organize with unions or among themselves.” [Washington Post, 2/6/20]

**Miller-Meeks Called The PRO Act “A Gift To Union Bosses”**

**Miller-Meeks On The PRO Act: “Even Though I Have Family Members Who Were Members Of Unions, I Could Not Support This Gift To Union Bosses.”** “Today, March 9th, 2021, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02), a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, released the following statement after voting NO on H.R. 842, the Protecting the Right to Organize Act. ‘Supporting workers and businesses are not mutually exclusive; we can do both at the same time. The PRO Act is an unnecessary challenge to the rights of business owners and workers alike. The bill would abolish right-to-work laws across the country, including the laws we have in Iowa, and is yet another attack on states’ rights. If this Administration really cared about workers’ rights, it would not have canceled the Keystone XL Pipeline on day one, a move that was opposed by several major unions, including the Teamsters and AFL-CIO. Even though I have family members who were members of unions, I could not support this gift to union bosses.’” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 3/9/21]

**2021: Miller-Meeks Said She Was Glad That John Deere And UAW Reached A Deal, Ending The John Deere Strike**

**Miller-Meeks: It Was “Great To Hear John Deere And UAW Reached A Deal This Evening” And The Deal**
Would “Go A Long Way To Supporting Iowa’s Economy.” “Great to hear John Deere and UAW reached a deal this evening. This deal will go a long way to supporting Iowa’s economy and making sure we continue to be the best place to work, live, do business, and raise a family.” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 11/17/21]

Miller-Meeks During The John Deere Strike: “I Hope Business And Labor Can Rapidly Find Common Ground That Benefits Each Other And We Can Continue Being A Shining Example Of What A Hard Days Work Means.” “John Deere has employed thousands of Iowa families for decades and has been a boost to the Iowa economy. I hope business and labor can rapidly find common ground that benefits each other and we can continue being a shining example of what a hard days work means.” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 10/17/21]

2015: Miller-Meeks Said Wisconsin Right To Work Legislation “Should Help Create More Jobs”


2015: Miller-Meeks Tweeted “Gov Scott Walker Has Amazing Record In Wisconsin With Balancing Budget, Stable Taxes & Reducing Power Of Public Unions. Now Right To Work?”

2019: Miller-Meeks Voted For A Bill Narrowing The Range Of Workplace Injuries Eligible For Workers’ Compensation

Workplace Safety & Workers’ Compensation

April 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Requiring Health Care And Social Service Industry Employers To Implement Comprehensive Workplace Violence Prevention Plans

April 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Requiring Health Care And Social Service Industry Employers To Implement Comprehensive Workplace Violence Prevention Plans. In April 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against: “Passage of the bill that would require health care and social service industry employers to develop and implement comprehensive workplace violence prevention plans. It would require the Occupational Safety and Health Administration to issue a final standard for such plans, based on 2015 OSHA guidelines, within 42 months of enactment and require employers to develop and implement such plans within six months of the final standard being issued. It would require workplace violence prevention plans to include certain procedures for reporting, responding to, and mitigating risks of incidents of workplace violence, including for employers to investigate and take corrective actions in response to violent incidents. It would require employers to investigate any workplace violence incident, risk, or hazard ‘as soon as practicable.’ It would also require employers to develop and implement plans with participation from employees and employee representatives; provide annual training to employees exposed to workplace violence hazards and risks; and maintain records related to workplace violence plans, incidents, and response for at least five years. The bill’s provisions would apply to employers of individuals working in most health care facilities, including hospitals, nursing homes, and drug abuse treatment centers, as well as employers of individuals providing related services, including home-based health care or social work and emergency services.” The bill passed 254 to 166. [HR 1195, Vote #118, 4/16/21; CQ, 4/16/21]

2019: Miller-Meeks Voted For SF 507, Which Changed The Definition Of Workplace Injuries Eligible For Workers’ Compensation

2019: Miller-Meeks Voted For SF 507, Which Changed The Definition Of Workplace Injuries Eligible For Workers’ Compensation. Miller-Meeks voted for SF 507, “A bill for an act relating to the definition of personal
injuries arising out of and in the course of the employment for the purposes of compensable acts for workers’ compensation.” The bill passed 32-17. [Iowa State Legislature, SF 507, 3/19/19]

- **SF 507 Made All Injuries Resulting From Unexplained Falls From One Surface Onto The Same Service Illegible For Workers’ Compensation.** “Personal injuries due to idiopathic or unexplained falls from a level surface onto the same level surface do not arise out of and in the course of employment and are not compensable under this chapter.” [Iowa State Legislature, SF 507, 3/19/19]

### Child Care

**May 2021: Miller-Meeks Sponsored A Bill To Monitor Compliance With ARP Child Care Funds**

May 2021: Miller-Meeks Sponsored HR 3615, the Child Care Funds Accountability Act, which would “require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to monitor compliance with the requirements of the American Rescue Plan relating to the uses of funds for child care.” The bill was read twice and referred to House Education and Labor. [HR 3615, Sponsored, 5/28/21; CQ, 5/28/21]

- **Miller-Meeks Said The Bill Would Dedicate A Portion Of ARP Funds Towards Preventing Duplication With PPP Loans.** “Today, May 28th, 2021, Reps. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02) and Vern Buchanan (FL-16) introduced the Child Care Funds Accountability Act. This legislation would require the Secretary of Health and Human Services (HHS) to monitor compliance with the requirements of the American Rescue Plan (ARP) relating to the use of funds for child care. Under the Child Care Funds Accountability Act, HHS would be required to dedicate a portion of the $35 million provided for federal administrative costs in the ARP to monitoring compliance of the use of funds with regard to the ARP stabilization grant funds. Under this legislation, HHS must monitor compliance with non-supplantation requirements in the ARP, and HHS must monitor and ensure that there is no duplication with PPP loans received by child care providers. ‘Child care services are too important to our working families to not have adequate oversight. Transparency is key to making sure our children are well taken care of,’ said Miller-Meeks. ‘We must ensure that taxpayer funds are spent appropriately and used as they are intended.’” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 5/28/21]

**2020: Miller-Meeks Voted For A Bill Introducing Limitations To Eligibility For Iowa’s Child Care Assistance Programs**

2020: Miller-Meeks Voted For SF 2366, Which Tightened Eligibility Requirements For Public Programs. Miller-Meeks voted for SF 2366, “A bill for an act relating to eligibility, work, and employment and training requirements for public assistance programs, including eligibility for child care assistance and community engagement activity requirements under the Iowa health and wellness plan, and including effective date and implementation provisions.” The bill passed 31-18. [Iowa State Legislature, SF 2366, 3/3/20]

- **SF 2366 Introduced Limitations To Eligibility For The Child Care Assistance Program.** “Senate File 2366 relates to work, employment and training requirements for public assistance programs, and childcare, and does the following: […] Section 3 provides that if families were previously eligible for the Child Care Assistance Program, they would be eligible for a graduated eligibility phaseout program if their income is at least 185.0% of the federal poverty level (FPL) but less than 225.0% FPL for basic care, or if their income is at least 200.0% FPL but less than 250.0% FPL for special needs care. In addition, families with income at 225.0% FPL for basic care or 250.0% FPL for special needs care would be required to pay a copayment of 50.0% of the cost of care currently reimbursed by the DHS.” [Iowa State Legislature, SF 2366 Fiscal Note, 3/2/20]
2019: Miller-Meeks Said She Was Reviewing Ways To Address Dwindling Availability Of Child Care In Iowa, Including Partnerships With The Private Sector

2019: Miller-Meeks Said She Was Reviewing Ways To Address Dwindling Availability Of Safe, Affordable Child Care In Iowa. “More than 116,000 Iowans now live in census tracts with no licensed care providers, according to a Center for American Progress analysis of U.S. Census and Iowa Department of Human Services data. Sen. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, an Ottumwa Republican, is reviewing ways to address dwindling availability of safe, affordable child care in Iowa. Transparency related to unregulated facilities is a worthy goal but will require further review to consider whether such actions could have unintended consequences, she said about Ehlert’s effort. ‘It would be something I’d certainly be willing to have dialogue about,’ Miller-Meeks said. Lisa Smith, the mother of a child who died in the care of a registered provider, believes the consequences of greater transparency would be greater child safety.” [Des Moines Register, 9/22/19]

Des Moines Register: Miller-Meeks Was “Reviewing How Partnerships Between Government And The Private Sector Might Help Resolve Some Of Iowa’s Day Care Issues.” “Iowa lawmakers have an ongoing interest in addressing what Sen. Mariannette Miller-Meeks calls a ‘financial cliff’ that occurs when families make just enough money to disqualify them from a child care assistance program. The Ottumwa Republican is also reviewing how partnerships between government and the private sector might help resolve some of Iowa’s day care issues. Miller-Meeks, a medical doctor, said she recognizes that some regulation is needed, but too much can be burdensome.” [Des Moines Register, 7/28/19]

Miller-Meeks Said “You Want Appropriate Regulations So Children Are Safe And Parents Can Feel Comfortable They Are Leaving Their Children In A Safe Environment, But Not So Much Regulation That You Push Professionals From The Marketplace.” “She believes lawmakers will review day care regulations in next year’s legislative session. ‘There is a balance there,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘You want appropriate regulations so children are safe and parents can feel comfortable they are leaving their children in a safe environment, but not so much regulation that you push professionals from the marketplace.’” [Des Moines Register, 7/28/19]

Independent Contractors

2020: Miller-Meeks Voted For SF 2296, Which Defined Certain Vehicle Operators Including Some Truck Drivers As Independent Contractors

2020: Miller-Meeks Voted For SF 2296, Which Defined Certain Vehicle Operators Including Some Truck Drivers As Independent Contractors. Miller-Meeks voted for SF 2296, “A bill for an act regarding persons who are deemed independent contractors when performing services while operating certain vehicles.” The bill passed 32-18. [Iowa State Legislature, SF 2296, 2/24/20]

Interest Group Ratings

2020: Miller-Meeks Had A Lifetime Rating Of 4% From Iowa Federation Of Labor, AFL-CIO

Career: Miller-Meeks Received A Lifetime Rating Of 4% From Iowa Federation Of Labor. [Iowa Federation of Labor, AFL-CIO, accessed 12/17/21]

2019: Miller-Meeks Received A Rating Of 0% From Iowa Federation Of Labor. [Iowa Federation of Labor, AFL-CIO, accessed 6/21/20]

2020: Miller-Meeks Received A Rating Of 7% From Iowa Federation Of Labor. [Iowa Federation of Labor, AFL-CIO, accessed 12/17/21]
Miller-Meeks Said That Prior To COVID-19, Trump’s Policies “Created An Unparalleled Economic Boom With Expansive Job Growth And Wage Increases”

Miller-Meeks: Prior To COVID-19, Trump’s Policies “Created An Unparalleled Economic Boom With Expansive Job Growth And Wage Increases.” “Said Miller-Meeks, ’Every individual, whether a candidate for office or not, is personally responsible for their own comments and conduct. I supported President Trump based on his policies and results for the American people and our country such as cutting taxes and decreasing business regulations. Prior to COVID, those policies created an unparalleled economic boom with expansive job growth and wage increases.’” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 1/18/21]
LGBTQ Issues

**Significant Findings**

- 2021: Miller-Meeks voted against the Equality Act, which would prohibit discrimination based on sex, sexual orientation, and gender identity.
- 2021: Miller-Meeks attended an event held by anti-LGBTQ organization the Family Leader.
- 2021: Miller-Meeks joined a letter urging Veterans Affairs Secretary McDonough to reverse the decision for VA to offer gender transition surgeries.
- 2019: Miller-Meeks voted for HF 766, an appropriations bill which banned Medicaid from covering transition-related health care in Iowa.
- 2019: Miller-Meeks said transgender athletes “competing in female sports” were “disadvantaging an entire group of people.”
- 2013: Under Miller-Meeks, the Iowa Public Health Department was criticized for requiring lesbian couples to go through a more complex process than straight couples to obtain birth certificates.
- 2010: Miller-Meeks’ House campaign website said she supported “traditional marriage.”
- 2010: Miller-Meeks said she supported repealing Don’t-Ask-Don’t-Tell after saying the decision should be left to the military.
  - February 2010: Miller-Meeks said that serving with LGBTQ soldiers “may be uncomfortable” for some.

**Discrimination**

**2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Equality Act, Which Would Prohibit Discrimination Based On Sex, Sexual Orientation, And Gender Identity**

Miller-Meeks Voted Against Passage Of The Equality Act, Which Would Prohibit Discrimination Or Segregation Based On Sex, Sexual Orientation And Gender Identity. In February 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against: “Passage of the bill that would prohibit discrimination or segregation based on sex, sexual orientation and gender identity under 1964 Civil Rights Act protections, including in public facilities, public education, federal assistance programs, employment, jury service and areas of public accommodation. It would expand the definition of "public accommodations" to include transportation services and any establishment providing a good, service or program -- including retailers, health care facilities and legal services. The bill would define "gender identity" as "gender-related identity, appearance, mannerisms or other gender-related characteristics of an individual," regardless of designated sex at birth. It would also allow the Justice Department to intervene in equal protection cases regarding sexual orientation and gender identity.” The bill passed 224-206. [HR 5, Vote #39, 2/25/21; CQ, 2/25/21]

- The Equality Act Would Prohibit Discrimination On The Basis Of Sexual Orientation And Gender Identity. “The House passed sweeping legislation on Friday that would prohibit discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity. […] The legislation, which amends the Civil Rights Act of 1964,
prohibits discrimination of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people in both the public and private sectors, offering civil rights protections in businesses, hospitals, and welfare services. It explicitly states that individuals cannot be denied access to a locker room or dressing room on the same basis.” [New York Times, 5/17/19]

Family Research Council

2021: Miller-Meeks Attended An Event Held By Anti-LGBTQ Organization The Family Leader


2014: The Family Leader President Bob Vander Plaats Said The Family Leader Supported Miller-Meeks’ Campaign. “The Family Leader, headed by conservative activist Bob Vander Plaats, kicked off the four-day trip with a news conference outside the Iowa Capitol. The initiative is co-sponsored by the National Organization for Marriage and the Faith Family Freedom Fund, an affiliate of the Family Research Council's Action political action committee. ‘I think the country is waking up to the leadership that has been going on in Washington and the left's agenda. I think this election is going to be a complete repudiation of these anti-family policies,’ Vander Plaats said. The nine-city tour, titled, ‘Standing for the American Family,’ is particularly backing the campaigns of four Republicans who support of traditional marriage and oppose abortion. They include U.S. Senate candidate Joni Ernst, as well as 3rd District Congressional candidate David Young, 1st District Congressional candidate Rod Blum, and 4th District U.S. Rep. Steve King. […] Vander Plaats said the tour sponsors are also supporting Republican Gov. Terry Branstad's reelection campaign and the GOP candidacy of Mariannette Miller-Meeks for the 2nd District Congressional seat, as well as Republicans seeking to gain control of the Iowa Senate. But the four candidates specifically endorsed by the tour had reached out to social conservatives for support, which is why their names are painted on the side of the tour bus, organizers said.” [Des Moines Register, 10/13/14]

Anti-Trans Votes And Statements

2019: Miller-Meeks Voted To Ban Medicaid From Covering Transition-Related Health Care Services In Iowa

2019: Miller-Meeks Voted For HF 766, The Health And Human Services Appropriations Bill. Miller-Meeks voted for HF 766, “A bill for an act relating to appropriations for health and human services and veterans and including other related provisions and appropriations, providing penalties, and including effective date and retroactive and other applicability date provisions.” The bill passed 31-17. [Iowa State Legislature, HF 766, 4/27/19]
• **HF 766 Prohibited Grant Funding For Planned Parenthood And Banned Medicaid From Covering Transition-Related Health Care In Iowa.** “On Saturday, the Iowa House passed HF 766 (the Health and Human Services budget bill). The bill bans Medicaid and all other insurance coverage funded by public dollars from paying for transition-related medical services for transgender Iowans. The bill also prevents Planned Parenthood and other entities that provide abortion services from engaging in competitive bidding for certain sexual education federal grants. The Iowa Senate passed the bill less than 24 hours earlier.” [WHO 13 Des Moines, 4/27/19]

• **HF 766 Allowed Publicly Funded Insurance To Deny Transition-Related Health Care.** “This section shall not require any state or local government unit or tax-supported district to provide for sex reassignment surgery or any other cosmetic, reconstructive, or plastic surgery procedure related to transsexualism, hermaphroditism, gender identity disorder, or body dysmorphic disorder.” [Iowa State Legislature, HF 766 Div. XX, 4/27/19]

---

2019: Miller-Meeks Said Transgender Athletes Were “Disadvantaging An Entire Group Of People”

Miller-Meeks: “It’s Also Concerning To Me When I See Biological Males Competing In Female Sports, […] Have We Gone Too Far In, In Support Of People Making Different Choices, When It Really Is Disadvantaging An Entire Group Of People?” According to an interview gave on Caffeinated Thoughts Podcast, when asked about gender identity to protected classes Miller-Meeks said “I certainly strongly believe that we need to protect religious liberty. It’s also concerning to me when I see as a woman when I see biological males competing in female sports, and winning in female sports, and allowed to compete. And so that brings up the question Have we gone too far in, in support of people making different choices, when it really is disadvantaging an entire group of people? I was told you need to read bills and understand them. I hesitate to say I wouldn’t support it. In Iowa have a balanced budget amendment but we didn’t care about deficit spending in the federal government.” [Caffeinated Thoughts, 12/3/19] (AUDIO) 00:28:38

2021: Miller-Meeks Joined A Letter Urging Veterans Affairs Secretary McDonough To Reverse The Decision For VA To Offer Life-Saving Gender Transition Surgeries

2021: Miller-Meeks Joined A Letter Urging Veterans Affairs Secretary McDonough To Reverse The Decision For VA To Offer Gender Transition Surgeries. “House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs (HVAC) Subcommittee on Health Ranking Member Jack Bergman, HVAC Ranking Member Mike Bost, and 40 Republican colleagues sent a letter to Veterans Affairs Secretary Denis R. McDonough, expressing grave concern with his intent to allow the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) to offer gender transition surgeries, while thousands of Veterans, including those suffering from toxic exposure, still are unable to receive the care and benefits they've earned. […] Joining Rep. Bergman and Ranking Member Bost were Reps: Jim Banks, Greg Murphy, Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Madison Cawthorn, Chip Roy, Tracey Mann, Barry Moore, Troy Nehls, Matt Rosendale, Nancy Mace, Steve Scalise, Jeff Duncan, Lisa McClain, Vern Buchanan, Brian Mast, Michael Guest, Doug Lamborn, Ralph Norman, Vicky Hartzler, Tim Burchett, Debbie Lesko, Lauren Boebert, Neal Dunn, Gus Bilirakis, Brian Babin, Diana Harshbarger, Stephanie Bice, Doug LaMalfa, Andy Harris, Jason Smith, Ron Estes, Kevin Hern, Brad Wenstrup, Glenn Grothman, Tim Walberg, Bruce Westerman, Jodey Arrington, Michael Cloud, Ben Cline, and Steve Womack. The letter stated in part, ‘We write to express our grave concern about your intent to allow the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) to offer gender transition surgery to our nation’s veterans. We urge you in the strongest possible terms to reverse your decision.’” [Office Of Rep. Jack Bergman, Press Release, 7/15/21]

• **New York Times: Gender Affirming Procedures “Are Now Widely Seen As Effective Treatment” To “Serious Health Concerns Like Substance Abuse, Suicide, And Suicidal Ideation.”** “Gender-confirming procedures reconstruct sexual organs to match the gender with which an individual identifies and have proved to mitigate serious health concerns like substance abuse, suicide and suicidal ideation, an administration official said, explaining the decision to change the policy. The procedures, which were once considered to be akin to cosmetic surgery, are now widely seen as effective treatment for such issues. The process for changing health
care benefits for transgender veterans could take years, and it is not known how many veterans would seek gender confirmation surgeries. The administration official said internal estimates showed that fewer than 4,000 veterans would be interested in the care. There are more than 134,000 transgender veterans, according to an estimate from the National Center for Transgender Equality.” [New York Times, 7/9/21]

### LGBTQ Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2013: Iowa Public Health Department Under Miller-Meeks Was Criticized For Requiring Lesbian Couples To Undergo A More Complicated Process To Obtain Birth Certificates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013: The Iowa Public Health Department Required Lesbian Couples To Undergo A More Complicated Process Than Straight Couples To Obtain Birth Certificates Naming Both Parents. “The group One Iowa told the Des Moines Register on Friday that married lesbian couples are being directed to follow an affidavit process and provide certified copies of their marriage license before obtaining a birth certificate naming both parents - a process opposite-sex couples do not have to go through. […] Mariannette Miller-Meeks, who heads the public health department, said the department is in the process of establishing new worksheets and educating hospital staff members regarding lesbian couples and the filing of birth certificates.” [Telegraph Herald, 7/28/13]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Miller-Meeks Said The Department Was “In The Process Of […] Educating Hospital Staff Members Regarding Lesbian Couples And The Filing Of Birth Certificates.” “The group One Iowa told the Des Moines Register on Friday that married lesbian couples are being directed to follow an affidavit process and provide certified copies of their marriage license before obtaining a birth certificate naming both parents - a process opposite-sex couples do not have to go through. […] Mariannette Miller-Meeks, who heads the public health department, said the department is in the process of establishing new worksheets and educating hospital staff members regarding lesbian couples and the filing of birth certificates.” [Telegraph Herald, 7/28/13]

Miller-Meeks Said An Order Preventing Any Changes To The Birth Certificate Process Was In Place And Lesbian Couples Needing Assistance Regarding Birth Certificates Should Call The Public Health Department. “An order preventing any changes to the birth certificate process was in place until July 8, Miller-Meeks said. Lesbian couples needing assistance regarding birth certificates should call the public health department, she said. In May, the Iowa Supreme Court ordered the department to start listing the names of both female spouses on the birth certificates of their children. The ruling appeared to be limited to lesbian couples who use sperm donors to conceive children.” [Telegraph Herald, 7/28/13]

### Marriage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2010: Miller-Meeks Said She Supported “Traditional Marriage”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miller-Meeks Said She Supported “Traditional Marriage.” On the Miller-Meeks for Congress 2010 website under “Traditional Iowa Values,” Miller-Meeks wrote “I am pro-life on the issue of abortion but do believe there must be reasonable exceptions for victims of rape and incest, or when the physical life of the mother is at stake. I also support traditional marriage.” [Miller-Meeks for Congress 2010, accessed 6/15/20]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Don’t Ask Don’t Tell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2010: Miller-Meeks Said She Supported Repealing Don’t-Ask-Don’t-Tell After Saying The Decision Should Be Left To The Military</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The Hawk Eye: “Miller-Meeks Said She Supports Repealing The Military’s Policy On Gay Soldiers Of Don’t-Ask-Don’t-Tell.” Because of Gates’ recent comments, and that of other top military officials -- and one place, other than the abstract notion of bipartisanship, that Loebsack and Miller-Meeks agree -- Miller-Meeks said she supports repealing the military’s policy on gay soldiers of don’t-ask-don’t-tell.” [The Hawk Eye, 4/7/10]

February 2010: Miller-Meeks Said That Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell Should Have Been Left To The Military, Saying That Serving With LGBTQ Soldiers “May Be Uncomfortable” For Some

Miller-Meeks Said That Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell Should Have Been Left To The Military, Saying That Serving With LGBTQ Soldiers “May Be Uncomfortable” For Some. “There was a disagreement on ending the military’s ‘don’t ask, don’t tell’ policy stopping openly gay, lesbian and bisexual people from serving. The decision should be left to the military, according to Miller-Meeks. ‘For some,’ the retired Army Reserve physician said, allowing openly gay soldiers to serve ‘may be uncomfortable.’ However, if someone is willing, they should be allowed to serve as long as that’s the decision of the military — not the president, Congress or the courts.” [Globe Gazette, 2/6/10]
National Defense & Security Issues

**Significant Findings**

- 2020: Miller-Meeks said the Departments of Energy and Homeland Security could be reduced.
- 2021: Miller-Meeks sponsored a bill establishing a medical countermeasures program for DHS employees in the event of a pandemic or biological or chemical attacks.
- 2021: Miller-Meeks voted for a provision allowing for the appointment of Gen. Lloyd J. Austin III as Secretary of Defense.
- During the Obama Administration, Miller-Meeks criticized the NSA for collecting data on American citizens, and said she was concerned about “government overreach in its use of drones.”

**FY 2022 NDAA**

**Miller-Meeks Voted For The FY2022 National Defense Authorization Act**

**December 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted For The FY2022 National Defense Authorization Act.** On December 7, 2021, Miller-Meeks voted for the “Passage of the bill, as amended, that would authorize $768.1 billion in national defense spending, including $740 billion for the Defense Department and $28.2 billion for national security programs within the Energy Department. The bill would authorize approximately $146.9 billion for weapons and other procurement; $27.3 billion for shipbuilding; and funding to support the procurement of 85 F-35 series tactical force aircraft. It would authorize $310 million for a hypersonic defense system and $75 million for the development of a new homeland defense radar in Hawaii. Within Energy Department funding, it would authorize $20.3 billion for the National Nuclear Security Administration, primarily for the maintenance of a nuclear weapons stockpile. It would authorize $35.5 billion for the Defense Health Program. It would authorize $13.3 billion for military construction. It would authorize a 2.7 percent military pay increase and increase parental leave for service members to 12 weeks. It would make numerous reforms to the Uniform Code of Military Justice to address sexual assault and harrassment and require independent military prosecutors, not unit commanders, to decide whether prosecution is warranted for most felonies within the military justice system, including sexual assault. It would authorize $7.1 billion for the Pacific Deterrence Initiative and $4 billion for the European Deterrence Initiative, primarily intended to counter aggression by China and Russia, respectively. It would establish a commission to examine the war in Afghanistan and 2021 withdrawal and require the department to submit a security assessment and a number of reports related to Afghanistan. For international assistance and cooperation, it would authorize $300 million for cooperative programs with Israel; $345 million for a cooperative threat reduction program assisting former Soviet Union countries; and $300 million in security assistance to Ukraine. Among other provisions, the bill would over $1.2 billion to support defense-wide cybersecurity efforts and over $285 million for artificial intelligence-related initiatives; authorize the establishment of a national network for microelectronics research and development to support domestic microelectronics manufacturing capability and an Arctic Security Initiative; and extend prohibitions on the use of Defense Department funds to close or transfer detainees from the U.S. naval station in Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.” Passed by a vote of 363-70. [S. 1605, Vote 405, 12/7/21; CQ, 12/7/21]

**September 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted For The FY2022 National Defense Authorization Act.** On September 23, 2021, Miller-Meeks voted for the “Passage of the bill, as amended, that would authorize $768.1 billion in national defense spending, including $739.8 billion for the Defense Department and $28.2 billion for national
security programs within the Energy Department. The bill would authorize approximately $147.1 billion for weapons and other procurement, $117.8 billion for F-35 series tactical force aircraft procurement and maintenance and $28.4 billion for shipbuilding. It would authorize $310 million for a hypersonic defense system and $75 million for the development of a new homeland defense radar in Hawaii. Within Energy Department funding, it would authorize $2.3 billion for the National Nuclear Security Administration, primarily for the maintenance of a nuclear weapons stockpile. It would authorize $36.8 billion for the Defense Health Program, including $10 million for a global emerging infectious surveillance program. It would authorize $13.4 billion for military construction. It would authorize a 2.7 percent military pay increase; remove military commanders from decisions related to the prosecution of sexual assault and other special victim crimes; establish a Countering Extremism Office within the Defense Department tasked with countering extremism in the armed forces; and establish a $15 minimum wage for certain department contractors. It would give the mayor of the District of Columbia authority over its National Guard and establish a Space National Guard. It would authorize $9 million for applied initiatives, and require the Homeland Security Department to establish an information collaboration environment to authorize over $1 billion in cybersecurity investments and over $1 billion for the Pacific Deterrence Initiative and $3.7 billion for the European Deterrence Initiative, primarily intended to counter aggression by China and Russia, respectively. It would codify the position of assistant secretary of Defense for Indo-Pacific Security Affairs. It would establish a commission to examine the war in Afghanistan and 2021 withdrawal; authorize $500 million for Defense Department relocation assistance for Afghan evacuees; and require the department to submit a security assessment and a number of reports related to Afghanistan. For international assistance and cooperation, the bill would authorize $470 million for cooperative programs with Israel; $345 million for a cooperative threat reduction program assisting former Soviet Union countries; $325 million for the Afghan security forces; and $300 million in security assistance to Ukraine. Among other provisions, the bill would authorize over $1 billion in cybersecurity investments and over $1 billion for artificial intelligence-related initiatives, and require the Homeland Security Department to establish an information collaboration environment to share intelligence and data on cybersecurity risks and threats. It would authorize $9 million for applied research on neuroprotection from brain injury; eliminate restrictions on transferring detainees from Guantanamo Bay; and prohibit federal banking regulators from penalizing financial service institutions for serving state-legal marijuana-related businesses.” The bill passed by a vote of 316-113. [H.R. 4350, Vote 293, 9/23/21; CQ, 9/23/21]

- **Miller-Meeks Said She Was Proud To See Provisions For Investigating The Origins Of COVID-19 In The FY 2022 NDAA.** “Today, September 23rd, 2021, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02) released the following statement after voting YES on H.R. 4350, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2022: ‘Ensuring that our military is properly equipped is one of Congress’ top priorities. This bipartisan bill provides top-of-the-line weapons and equipment, increases servicemember pay by 2.7%, and provides $25 billion more in funding over the President’s budget request,’ said Miller-Meeks. ‘I was pleased to see provisions I fought for were included in this package, including my bipartisan Veterans in Parks Act, my DHS Medical Countermeasures Act, the Global War on Terrorism Memorial Location Act, continuing to investigate the origins of COVID-19, and holding the Administration accountable for the disastrous withdrawal from Afghanistan. I look forward to working with my colleagues to get this legislation to the President’s desk.’” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 9/23/21]

- **Miller-Meeks Voted Against An Amendment To Reduce And Transfer Defense Funding.** In September 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against: “Jacobs, D-Calif., for Lee, D-Calif., amendment no. 41 that would reduce amounts authorized for defense spending in fiscal 2022 by $23.96 billion and require the Defense Department to transfer, from amounts made available for fiscal 2022, no less than $1.6 billion to the general fund of the Treasury.” The amendment was rejected by a vote of 142 to 286. [HR 4350, Vote #285, 9/23/21; CQ, 9/24/21]

- **Miller-Meeks Voted Against An Amendment To Reduce Overall Defense Authorization Funding By 10%.** In September 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against: “Ocasio-Cortez, D-N.Y., for Pocan, D-Wis., amendment no. 40 that would reduce the overall funding authorization level by 10 percent, other than funding for military personnel, the Defense Department federal civilian workforce, and defense health program accounts.” The amendment was rejected by a vote of 86 to 332. [HR 4350, Vote #284, 9/23/21; CQ, 9/24/21]

- **Miller-Meeks Voted Against An Amendment To Prohibit Funding For Ground Based Strategic Deterrent Program.** In September 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against: “Garamendi, D-Calif., amendment no.
38 that would prohibit funding for the Ground Based Strategic Deterrent program and W87-1.” The amendment was rejected by a vote of 118 to 299. [HR 4350, Vote #282, 9/23/21; CQ, 9/24/21]

- **Miller-Meeks Voted Against An Amendment To Prohibit The Export Of Certain Weapons Without Notifying Congress.** In September 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against: “Torres, D-Calif., amendment no. 435 that would prohibit the export of certain weapons to foreign countries unless the Commerce Department notifies the chair and ranking members of the congressional foreign issues committees before granting the export license.” The amendment was adopted by a vote of 215 to 213. [HR. 4350, Vote #292, 9/23/21; CQ, 9/24/21]

### Homeland Security

#### 2020: Miller-Meeks Said The Departments Of Energy And Homeland Security Could Be Reduced

“Scheinblum asked the candidates what agency or governmental department they would reform or eliminate, if elected. […] Miller-Meeks also said education should be left to states to manage. She said the Departments of Energy and Homeland Security could be reduced.” [Muscatine Journal, 7/2/20]

### Chemical And Biological Warfare

#### 2021: Miller-Meeks Sponsored A Bill Establishing A Medical Countermeasures Program For DHS Employees In The Event Of A Pandemic Or Biological Or Chemical Attacks

May 2021: **Miller-Meeks Sponsored A Bill Establishing A Medical Countermeasures Program For DHS Employees In The Event Of A Pandemic Or Biological Or Chemical Attacks.** On May 17, 2021, Miller-Meeks sponsored HR 3263, the DHS Medical Countermeasures Act, which “directs the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to establish a medical countermeasures program to facilitate personnel readiness and protection for DHS employees and working animals in the event of a chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, or explosives attack, naturally occurring disease outbreak, or pandemic, and to support DHS mission continuity. The Chief Medical Officer of DHS shall (1) provide programmatic oversight of the program, (2) establish a medical countermeasures working group, and (3) develop and submit to DHS an integrated logistics support plan for medical countermeasures.” On November 3, 2021, consideration and markup was deferred by the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee. [HR 3263, Sponsored, 5/17/21; CQ, 11/3/21]

- **July 2021: HR 3263 Passed The House 319-105.** In May 2021, Miller-Meeks introduced HR 3263: “This bill directs the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to establish a medical countermeasures program to facilitate personnel readiness and protection for DHS employees and working animals in the event of a chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, or explosives attack, naturally occurring disease outbreak, or pandemic, and to support DHS mission continuity. The Chief Medical Officer of DHS shall (1) provide programmatic oversight of the program, (2) establish a medical countermeasures working group, and (3) develop and submit to DHS an integrated logistics support plan for medical countermeasures.” The motion was passed 319-105. [HR 3263, Vote #212, 7/20/21; CQ, 7/20/21]

### Secretary Of Defense Appointment

#### 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted For Providing For An Exception To Retirement Tenure Limitation Against Appointment Of Gen. Lloyd J. Austin III As Secretary Of Defense

Miller-Meeks Voted For Providing For An Exception To A Limitation Against Appointment Of Gen. Lloyd J. Austin III As Secretary Of Defense. In January 2021, Miller-Meeks voted for: “Passage of the bill that would
waive a statutory requirement related to date of retirement from military service for the first individual nominated by the president and confirmed by the Senate as Defense secretary on or after Jan. 20, 2021. Specifically, it would make eligible such an individual who retired from active duty in the armed forces within seven years of their appointment, but not within four years. It would thus allow for the confirmation of President Joe Biden's Defense secretary nominee, retired Army Gen. Lloyd J. Austin III. The bill passed 326 to 78. [H Res 335, Vote #18, 1/21/21; CQ, 1/21/21]

- **Gen Lloyd J. Austin III Needed The Waiver Because He Retired From Active Duty In The Armed Forces Less Than Seven Years Before His Appointment As Secretary Of Defense.** “The House of Representatives and Senate approved a waiver Thursday for retired Army Gen. Lloyd Austin to serve as President Biden's defense secretary. Both votes were overwhelming and bipartisan. Normally the House has no role in confirming Cabinet secretaries. But Austin retired from the military four years ago, short of the seven years required by law to take the civilian job without a waiver from both houses of Congress.” [NPR, 1/21/21]

### Military Readiness

#### 2020: Miller-Meeks Said She Supported Trump Maintaining “America’s Most Highly-Skilled And Well-Equipped Military In The World”

Miller-Meeks Said She Supported Trump Maintaining “America’s Most Highly-Skilled And Well-Equipped Military In The World.” Mariannette Miller-Meeks Facebook page, Miller-Meeks said “I will stand alongside President Trump to ensure that America maintains the most highly-skilled and well-equipped military in the world.” [Facebook, Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 5/15/20]

![Mariannette Miller-Meeks Facebook](https://www.mariannette.meeks.us/about)

[Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Facebook, 5/15/20]

### National Security Administration

#### Miller-Meeks Believed The Government Should Be More Transparent In Their Surveillance Activities

Miller-Meeks Believed The NSA, And Courts Dealing With Federal Surveillance, Needed To Be More Transparent In Their Surveillance Activities. “In addition, Miller-Meeks said that she stands for more government accountability and transparency. For example, even though she said she is a supporter of national defense, she believes that the National Security Agency and the courts dealing with federal surveillance need to be
more open with the American people regarding their activities and what they plan to do with the information they gather.” [Muscatine Journal, 2/27/14]

### Miller-Meeks Criticized “Government Overreach In Its Use Of Drones”

**Miller-Meeks Criticized “Government Overreach In Its Use Of Drones.”** “Miller-Meeks criticized government overreach in its use of drones, NSA spying and IRS investigations into conservative political groups. She faulted Congress for not addressing the patient-care scandals at the Veterans Administration, and the Environmental Protection Agency for what she called a ‘war on coal.’ When it comes to government aid programs, she said, the social safety net should be transformed into a trampoline, ‘so you never hit bottom but you’re propelled and boosted upward.’” [Des Moines Register, 8/8/14]

### Miller-Meek Criticized The NSA For Collecting Data On Americans After Previously Saying They Were Not Doing So

**Miller-Meek Criticized The NSA For Collecting Data On Americans After Previously Saying They Were Not Doing So.** “Miller-Meeks said she was amazed by the ‘Main Stream Press’ and how for at least the past five years they have failed to call the Obama administration to task for a long list of alleged transgressions. She pointed to Fast and Furious allegedly backed by the U.S. Justice Department dealing with gun running, IRS targeting of conservative non-profits, NSA collecting data on Americans after saying they were not, the FCC idea to monitor all American newsrooms and Benghazi, where Americans died.” [Ad Express & Daily Iowegian, 4/18/14]
Policing & Public Safety Issues

**Significant Findings**

- Miller-Meeks voted against the George Floyd Justice In Policing Act, which banned police chokeholds, ended qualified immunity, and mandated better data collection and misconduct reporting.
  - Miller-Meeks said she voted against the bill because ending qualified immunity “would make recruitment and retention difficult and increase retirement.”
  - Miller-Meeks called the Justice In Policing Act “a backdoor way to defund the police.”
  - Miller-Meeks said she supported the Republican-sponsored JUSTICE Act instead, which called for a policy change banning chokeholds but would not enact that ban into law.

- May 2021: Miller-Meeks said she thought police reforms should focus on “real solutions” like improving training and “empowering police chiefs to fire bad cops.”

- May 2021: Miller-Meeks co-sponsored the Defund Cities That Defund the Police Act.

- September 2021: Miller-Meeks voted against an amendment to limit the transfer of surplus military equipment like grenade launchers and weaponized drones to local law enforcement.

- June 2020: Miller-Meeks voted for Iowa policing reform that banned the use of chokeholds.

- 2019: Miller-Meeks voted to prohibit automated traffic law enforcement.

- September 2021: Miller-Meeks claimed her opponent Christina Bohannan wanted to abolish law enforcement, a claim rated “false” by PolitiFact Iowa.

- May 2021: Miller-Meeks voted for condemning the “heinous and inexcusable acts of gun violence” that killed eight people in Georgia on March 16, 2021.

- November 2021: A local conservative columnist criticized Miller-Meeks from the right for “failing to act on marijuana legalization,” thereby “promoting lawlessness and high taxes.”

- September 2021: Miller-Meeks voted for the elimination of the federal sentencing disparity between crack and powder cocaine.

- 2021: Miller-Meeks voted for reauthorizing the Violence Against Women Act for five years, expanding protections for survivors of domestic abuse and stalking.
  - The bill was opposed by the NRA because of provisions to prevent people convicted of domestic abuse and stalking from purchasing guns.
  - Miller-Meeks voted for adding an amendment to extend the Violence Against Women Act only for one year, instead of five.

- 2021: Miller-Meeks voted against the Family Violence Prevention Act.
Police Reform

March 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against The George Floyd Justice In Policing Act

Miller-Meeks Voted Against The George Floyd Justice In Policing Act, Which Banned Chokeholds, Ended Qualified Immunity, And Mandated Better Data Collection And Misconduct Reporting

Miller-Meeks Voted Against The George Floyd Justice In Policing Act, Overhauling Policing Laws. In March 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against The George Floyd Justice In Policing Act. NPR described the bill: “The [George Floyd Justice in Policing Act] would ban chokeholds and end qualified immunity for law enforcement — the legal protection for police officers that limits victims’ ability to sue for misconduct. It would ban no-knock warrants in federal drug cases, mandate data collection on police encounters and create a nationwide police misconduct registry to help hold problematic officers accountable. The bill would also prohibit racial and religious profiling and redirect funding to community-based policing programs.” The motion was agreed to by a vote of 220 - 212. [HR 1280, Vote #60, 3/3/21; CQ, 3/3/21]

- The Bill Banned Chokeholds, Ended Qualified Immunity For Law Enforcement, Banned No-Knock Warrants In Federal Drug Cases, Mandated Data Collection On Police Encounters, And Created A Nationwide Police Misconduct Registry. “The [George Floyd Justice in Policing Act] would ban chokeholds and end qualified immunity for law enforcement — the legal protection for police officers that limits victims’ ability to sue for misconduct. It would ban no-knock warrants in federal drug cases, mandate data collection on police encounters and create a nationwide police misconduct registry to help hold problematic officers accountable. The bill would also prohibit racial and religious profiling and redirect funding to community-based policing programs.” [NPR, 4/21/21]

Miller-Meeks Said She Voted Against The Bill Because Ending Qualified Immunity “Would Make Recruitment And Retention Difficult And Increase Retirement”

Miller-Meeks Said She Voted Against The George Floyd Justice In Policing Act Because Eliminating Qualified Immunity “Would Make Recruitment And Retention Difficult And Increase Retirement.” “Nearly a year after he was killed in custody by ex-Minneapolis police officer Derek Chauvin, the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act faces a divided Senate after it passed in the House of Representatives this past March. President Joe Biden (D) has urged Congress to pass a police reform bill this month, and this piece of legislation enhances existing enforcement mechanisms to remedy violations by law enforcement, such as lowering the criminal intent standard from willful to knowing or reckless, to convict a law enforcement officer for misconduct in a federal prosecution. Congresswoman for Iowa’s 2nd District Mariannette Miller-Meeks tells KCII that the U.S. needs bipartisan police reform, and she explains her vote of nay against the bill, ‘The Justice in Policing Act would eliminate qualified immunity which would make recruitment and retention difficult and increase retirement. I know this because prior to my vote on this I actually called to both sheriff’s departments and police, and division of special investigations. So I actually called to speak with members and people in Iowa about the bill prior to voting on it and how it would affect them.’” [KCII, 5/8/21]

Miller-Meeks Called The George Floyd Justice In Policing Act “A Backdoor Way To Defund The Police”

helps good officers do their jobs. The Justice in Policing Act would eliminate qualified immunity, which would make recruitment and retention difficult and increase retirements, decrease the number of officers on patrol, and cost taxpayer dollars as municipalities litigate frivolous lawsuits. In effect, this is a backdoor way to defund the police.” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 3/3/21]

Miller-Meeks Said She Supported The Republican-Sponsored JUSTICE Act Instead, Which Called For A Policy Change, Not A Law, Banning Chokeholds

Miller-Meeks Said She Supported Rep. Pete Stauber’s JUSTICE Act As Part Of Her Explanation For Voting Against The George Floyd Justice In Policing Act. “Today, March 3rd, 2021, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02) issued the following statement after voting NO on the Justice in Policing Act: ‘We need serious bipartisan police reform that holds bad officers accountable and helps good officers do their jobs. The Justice in Policing Act would eliminate qualified immunity, which would make recruitment and retention difficult and increase retirements, decrease the number of officers on patrol, and cost taxpayer dollars as municipalities litigate frivolous lawsuits. […] I am proud to be a co-sponsor of the Just and Unifying Solutions to Invigorate Communities Everywhere (JUSTICE) Act, which was introduced by Rep. Pete Stauber (MN-08). The JUSTICE Act would improve law enforcement transparency, ban chokeholds, make lynching a federal crime, increase the use and number of body cameras, increase implicit bias training, ensure bad officers are held accountable, and improve officer performance.’” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 3/3/21]

- Stauber’s JUSTICE Act Called For A Policy Change Banning Chokeholds But Would Not Enact The Ban Into Law. “The House Democrats’ effort bans federal law enforcement from using chokeholds except in a limited deadly force capacity. The GOP bill has similar language. While both bills aim to tie federal money to state and local governments taking similar action, Democrats want the chokehold ban enacted into law, while Republicans call for a policy change. ‘The George Floyd Act just has teeth that the JUSTICE Act doesn’t,’ said Maria Ponomarenko, an associate law professor at the University of Minnesota who is also co-founder and counsel of the Policing Project at the NYU School of Law.” [Minneapolis Star-Tribune, 3/19/21]

September 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against An Amendment To Limit The Transfer Of Surplus Military Equipment Like Grenade Launchers And Armed Drones To Local Law Enforcement

Miller-Meeks Voted Against An Amendment To Limit The Transfer Of Surplus Military Equipment To Local Law Enforcement, Including Grenade Launchers, Explosives, And Weaponized Drones. In September 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against: “Johnson, D-Ga., amendment no. 36 that would restrict the Defense Department from transferring certain surplus military equipment, including controlled firearms, ammunition, grenade launchers, explosives, certain vehicles, weaponized drones and long-range acoustic devices, to federal, state or local law enforcement agencies.” The amendment was rejected by a vote of 198 to 231. [HR 4350, Vote #281, 9/23/21; CQ, 9/24/21]

May 2021: Miller-Meeks Said She Thought Police Reforms Should Focus On “Real Solutions” Like Improving Training And “Empowering Police Chiefs To Fire Bad Cops”

Miller-Meeks: “We Should Focus On Real Solutions Like Empowering Police Chiefs To Fire Bad Cops And Improving Police Training And Accountability In Line With Best Practices.” “Defunding or abolishing the police would make our communities less secure and more vulnerable to criminal activity, putting all of our families at risk. We must produce constructive ways to reform and improve our policing system, not strip departments of critical funding for training, equipment, community engagement programs, and body cameras. To reform our police system, we should focus on real solutions like empowering police chiefs to fire bad cops and improving police training and accountability in line with best practices, similar to reforms I proudly supported as a State Senator in Iowa.” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 5/13/21] (VIDEO)

- Miller-Meeks Said Such Proposed Reforms Were “Similar To Reforms I Proudly Supported As A State...
Senator In Iowa.” “Defunding or abolishing the police would make our communities less secure and more vulnerable to criminal activity, putting all of our families at risk. We must produce constructive ways to reform and improve our policing system, not strip departments of critical funding for training, equipment, community engagement programs, and body cameras. To reform our police system, we should focus on real solutions like empowering police chiefs to fire bad cops and improving police training and accountability in line with best practices, similar to reforms I proudly supported as a State Senator in Iowa.” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 5/13/21] (VIDEO)

June 2020: Miller-Meeks Voted For Iowa Policing Reform That Banned The Use Of Chokeholds And Added Training Provisions

2020: Miller-Meeks Voted For Policing Reform That Banned The Use Of Chokeholds And Added Provisions For Training Police Officers. Miller-Meeks voted for HF 2647, “A bill for an act relating to peace officers, including the certification, training, and prosecution of peace officers and the use of chokeholds by peace officers, and including effective date and retroactive applicability provisions.” The bill passed 49-0. [Iowa State Legislature, HF 2647, 6/11/20]

Police Defunding & Abolition

September 2021: Miller-Meeks Falsely Claimed That Her Opponent Christina Bohannan Wanted To Abolish Law Enforcement

September 2021: Miller-Meeks Tweeted A Claim That Christina Bohannan Wanted To Abolish Law Enforcement

Miller-Meeks Claimed Bohannan Wanted To “Abolish” Law Enforcement. “I support law enforcement. My opponent wants to abolish them. The choice is clear:” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 9/8/21]

PolitiFact Iowa: Miller-Meeks’ Claim That Bohannan Wanted To Abolish Law Enforcement Was “False”

PolitiFact Iowa: Miller-Meeks’ Claim That Bohannan Wanted To Abolish Law Enforcement Was “False.” “Miller-Meeks said Bohannan wants to abolish law enforcement. She supports her statement with The Washington Free Beacon article and her explanation that where someone puts their money reflects their values. The donation, however, was to a bail and bond project, not a law enforcement abolishment plan. Bohannan has made statements on the Iowa House floor and in an op-ed, saying she supports law enforcement, which PolitiFact finds to be more relevant than the 2019 Facebook donation to the Prairielands Freedom Fund. For these reasons, we rate the claim that Bohannan supports abolishing law enforcement False.” [PolitiFact Iowa, 9/17/21]

Miller-Meeks Had Previously Criticized Bohannan For What She Called A “Disturbing And Disappointing” Failure To Adequately Support Law Enforcement

Miller-Meeks: Bohannan’s “Vision Of The Future” Was “More Division And Social Unrest, Less Support For Law Enforcement, And Less Personal Freedom For Those Of Us Who Play By The Rules.” “In a statement released Tuesday, Miller-Meeks welcomed Bohannan to the race, but criticized her opposition to a ban on mask mandates and a so-called ‘Back the Blue’ bill. ‘I am certain that the voters of Iowa’s Second Congressional District want a congresswoman who has proven her commitment to building a better future for working families, Iowa and the nation rather than one whose vision of the future is more division and social unrest, less support for law enforcement, and less personal freedom for those of us who play by the rules,’ Miller-Meeks’ statement reads in part.” [Iowa Public Radio, 8/24/21]

Miller-Meeks Criticized Bohannan’s Vote Against Iowa’s “Back The Blue” Legislation, Saying It Was
“Disturbing And Disappointing.” “Miller-Meeks also criticized her vote against the ‘Back the Blue’ legislation passed in the Iowa Legislature. ‘She has voted against more funding for law enforcement that keeps us safe when she voted against the Back the Blue legislation. This legislation increased penalties for rioting, public disorder, blocking a roadway, harassing peace officers, damaging public property and disorderly conduct. That vote alone is disturbing and disappointing considering that Representative Bohannan, as a member of the University of Iowa faculty, would have seen firsthand the destructive aftermath of last year’s supposedly peaceful protesters that inflicted more than $1 million in damage on Iowa’s Old Capitol, the Field House and numerous other buildings on campus and dangerously blocked traffic on Interstate 80,’ she stated.” [Iowa Torch, 8/25/21]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>May 2021: Miller-Meeks Co-Sponsored The Defund Cities That Defund The Police Act</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 2021: Miller-Meeks Said She Signed On To Co-Sponsor The Defund Cities That Defund The Police Act. “Earlier today, I signed on as a co-sponsor to the bipartisan Defund Cities that Defund the Police Act. Introduced by Representatives Fitzpatrick, Golden, Stauber, and Lamb, this piece of legislation would prevent jurisdictions that defund the police from receiving certain federal grants, stopping specific federal taxpayer dollars from bankrolling jurisdictions that intentionally make their communities less safe. Under this legislation, any jurisdiction that chooses to defund the police is choosing to defund themselves of federal assistance. Municipalities around the country that wish to defund or abolish the police will only harm their communities. America does not need to defund or abolish the police. We need to fund and support law enforcement.” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 5/13/21] (VIDEO)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>May 2021: Miller-Meeks Said Police Were Necessary, “Deserve Our Respect And Gratitude,” And Anyone Calling For Defunding Or Abolition Was “Flat-Out Wrong”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miller-Meeks: “Those Calling For The Defunding Or Abolishment Of The Police As A Serious Policy Are Flat-Out Wrong.” “Many of my colleagues have called to reform, defund, and even abolish police departments. While I do believe that our policing system is in need of serious bipartisan and commonsense reforms, I will never support defunding or abolishing the police. Those calling for the defunding or abolishment of the police as a serious policy are flat-out wrong.” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 5/13/21] (VIDEO)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>August 2020: Miller-Meeks Signed The Heritage Action For America Police Pledge, Which Required She Pledge To “Oppose Any Bill, Resolution Or Movement To ‘Defund The Police’”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miller-Meeks Signed The Heritage Action For America Police Pledge, Which Stated “I Stand With America's Police And Pledge To Oppose Any Bill, Resolution Or Movement To ‘Defund The Police.’” “The endorsement of the Ottumwa Republican in the open-seat race to succeed retiring Rep. Dave Loebsack comes after Miller-Meeks signed the police pledge by Heritage Action for America, a conservative advocacy group. The pledge states ‘A lawful society - free from mob rule and violent insurrection - is not possible without law enforcement. Police officers ... dedicate their lives to upholding the law and protecting the sacred rights of their fellow citizens. As a profession, they deserve support and respect. I stand with America's police and pledge to oppose any bill, resolution or movement to ‘Defund the Police.’” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 8/31/20]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Police – Additional Votes And Endorsements
May 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Blocking Consideration Of The Back The Blue Act, Which Would Make Killing Or Assaulting A Law Enforcement Officer A Federal Crime

Miller-Meeks Voted Against Blocking Consideration Of The Back The Blue Act, Which Would Make Killing, Attempting To Kill, Or Assaulting A Law Enforcement Officer A Federal Crime. In May 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against: “Perlmutter, D-Colo., motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and possibility of amendment).” According to the Congressional Record, Rep. Bacon said, “I rise to urge defeat of the previous question so that we can immediately consider my bill to ensure that those who risk their lives to protect all of us are afforded greater protections as well. I introduced the Back the Blue Act of 2021 with Senator Cornyn in the Senate and my two original cosponsors in the House, Representatives Stivers and Johnson, during Police Week because this bill is needed now more than ever. […] The Back the Blue Act creates a new Federal crime for killing, attempting to kill, or conspiring to kill a Federal judge, Federal law enforcement officer or a federally funded public safety officer. The offender would be subject to the death penalty and a mandatory minimum sentence of 30 years if death results. The offender would otherwise face a minimum sentence of 10 years. The bill creates a new Federal crime for assaulting a federally funded law enforcement officer with escalating penalties, including mandatory minimums based on the extent of any injury and the use of a dangerous weapon. However, no prosecution can be commenced absent certification by the Attorney General that prosecution is appropriate.” A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of the bill. The motion was agreed to by a vote of 212-206. [HR 2547, Vote #135, 5/12/21; CQ, 5/12/21; Congressional Record, 5/12/21]

August 2020: Miller-Meeks Was Endorsed By A Coalition Of Current And Retired Local Law Enforcement Officials

August 2020: Miller-Meeks Was Endorsed By A Coalition Of Current And Retired Law Enforcement Officers. “A coalition of current and retired law enforcement officers has endorsed state Sen. Mariannette Miller-Meeks for Congress for her support for the rule of law and opposition to calls to defund the police. ‘She has a deep and abiding commitment for the rule of law and she doesn’t waver in that support,’ Muscatine County Sheriff C.J. Ryan said in his endorsement. Miller has demonstrated from the beginning her support and respect for law enforcement.’” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 8/31/20]

- The Coalition Of Endorsers Included Local Sheriffs, Police Sergeants, And Local Political Figures With Experience As Police Officers. “Knoxville Police Chief Aaron Fuller said he considers himself apolitical, but he's backing Miller-Meeks because 'now more than ever, police officers need a champion in Congress, and I believe that Mariannette will be that champion.’ Members of the law enforcement coalition include: Appanoose County Sheriff Gary Anderson, Cedar County Sheriff Warren Wethington, Jefferson County Chief Deputy Bart Richmond, Marion County Sheriff Jason Sandholdt, Knoxville Police Chief Aaron Fuller, Muscatine County Sheriff C.J. Ryan, Muscatine County Sheriff's Capt. Quinn Riess, Scott County Sheriff Tim Lane, retired Davenport Officer Tim Brandenburg, retired Davenport Police Sgt. Jeanne Christensen, Davenport Police Sgt. Eric Gruenhagen, Washington County Sheriff Jared Schneider, Wayne County Sheriff Keith Davis, Clinton Deputy Police Chief Bill Grenwald; Iowa State Patrol trooper and state Rep. Jon Thorup, Scott County Sheriff's Reserve Deputy and state Sen. Chris Cournoyer, Wapello County Sheriff's Deputy Jeff Layton, retired Ottumwa Police Lt. Mike McDonough, Ottumwa Officer Darren Batterson, LeClaire Police Sgt. Mike Gonzales, Princeton Police Chief Brian Carsten, Clinton Chief Kevin Gyron, Muscatine County Sheriff's Deputy Jim Ludman, Blue Grass Chief Garret Jahns, Walcott Chief Jeff Blake, Muscatine County Sheriff's Deputy Kenny Hora, retired Davenport Chief Steve Lynn, Muscatine County Sheriff's Deputy Les Wegter, retired Fairfield Chief Rod Smith, and retired Phoenix police lieutenant, U.S. Marshal and current Clinton City Council member Bill Schemers.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 8/31/20]

2019: Miller-Meeks Voted To Prohibit Automated Traffic Law Enforcement

2019: Miller-Meeks Voted To Prohibit Automated Traffic Law Enforcement. Miller-Meeks voted for SF 343, “a bill for an act prohibiting the use of automated or remote systems for traffic law enforcement, including
prohibiting the sharing of related information and requiring the removal of existing systems, and including effective date provisions.” The bill passed by vote 30-19. [Iowa State Legislature, SF 343, 3/26/19]

Hate Crimes

May 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted For Condemning The “Heinous And Inexcusable Acts Of Gun Violence” That Killed Eight People In Georgia On March 16, 2021

May 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted For Condemning The “Heinous And Inexcusable Acts Of Gun Violence” That Killed Eight People In Georgia On March 16, 2021. In May 2021, Miller-Meeks voted for: “Agreeing to the resolution that would state that the House of Representatives condemns the "heinous and inexcusable acts of gun violence" that killed eight people in Georgia on March 16, 2021, and any racism or sexism in the choice of the shooter to target Asian-owned businesses and kill seven women, six of whom were of Asian descent. It would also state that the House honors the memory of the victims, recognizes the "long and difficult" healing process for affected communities, and reaffirms the commitment of the U.S. government to combat hate, bigotry, and violence against Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders and to prevent similar acts in the future.” The resolution was passed 245 to 180. [H Res 275, Vote #149, 5/19/21; CQ, 5/19/21]

May 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted For Requiring The DOJ To Designate An Employee Solely Responsible For Facilitating The Expedited Review Of Hate Crimes

May 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted For Requiring The DOJ To Designate An Employee Solely Responsible For Facilitating The Expedited Review Of Hate Crimes During And Up To One Year After The End Of The COVID-19 Public Health Emergency. In May 2021, Miller-Meeks voted for: “Nadler, D-N.Y., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill that would require the Justice Department to designate an employee solely responsible for facilitating the expedited review of hate crimes during and up to one year after the end of the COVID-19 public health emergency. It would require the DOJ to issue guidance for state and local law enforcement agencies on how to establish online hate crime and incident reporting; collect data disaggregated by protected characteristics; and expand public education campaigns to raise awareness and reach victims of hate crimes. It would authorize new Justice Department grants to support activities by state and local law enforcement related to hate crime reporting, prevention, and response, including to implement the National Incident-Based Reporting system and to update policies and systems, train personnel, and engage in community outreach to address hate crimes. It would require state and local governments receiving funds to report certain information to the DOJ regarding hate crimes committed and related law enforcement activities. It would also require the DOJ to make grants to states to create state-run hate crime reporting hotlines that would direct individuals to local support services and law enforcement, if appropriate. Finally, it would allow courts to require that an individual convicted in relation to a hate crime and placed on supervised release undertake educational classes or community service related to the community harmed by the offense.” The motion was agreed to 364 to 62. [S 937, Vote #145, 5/18/21; CQ, 5/18/21]

Drugs

November 2021: A Local Conservative Columnist Criticized Miller-Meeks From The Right For “Failing To Act On Marijuana Legalization,” Thereby “Promoting Lawlessness And High Taxes”

Cedar Rapids Gazette Columnist Adam Sullivan: By Failing To Act On Marijuana Legalization, Miller-Meeks Was “Promoting Lawlessness And High Taxes.” “Hinson, Miller-Meeks and Feenstra are on the record explicitly acknowledging the tension they have created between state and federal law. They all voted for a bill in the Iowa Legislature last year directing state bureaucrats to request guarantees that Iowa’s federal funding would not be jeopardized over the state operating an illegal medical cannabis program. […] Marijuana legalization is inevitable. The federal government is not going to go back to doing major raids on legitimate weed businesses in legal states. By failing to act, federal Republicans are in effect promoting lawlessness and high taxes.” [Cedar
September 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted For The Elimination Of The Federal Sentencing Disparity Between Crack And Powder Cocaine

Miller-Meeks Voted For The Elimination Of The Federal Sentencing Disparity Between Crack And Powder Cocaine. In September 2021 Miller-Meeks voted for: “Nadler, D-N.Y., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill that would eliminate the federal sentencing disparity between crack cocaine and powder cocaine by repealing a law that authorizes higher penalties for crack cocaine offenses compared to powder cocaine offenses, with the repeal effective retroactively. It would authorize sentencing courts to impose reduced sentences under the new guidelines for individuals convicted prior to the bill's enactment.” The motion passed by a vote of 361-66. [H.R. 1693, Vote #297, 9/28/21; CQ, 9/28/21]

September 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted For An Extension Of The Final Report Deadline For The Commission On Combating Synthetic Opioid Trafficking

Miller-Meeks Voted For An Extension Of The Final Report Deadline For The Commission On Combating Synthetic Opioid Trafficking. In September 2021 Miller-Meeks voted for: “Wild, D-Pa., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill that would extend by 120 days, to October 2021, the deadline for the Commission on Combating Synthetic Opioid Trafficking, which was established by the fiscal 2020 defense authorization bill (PL 116-92), to submit a final report to Congress on its activities and recommendations.” The motion passed by a vote of 410-14. [H.R. 4981, Vote #298, 9/28/21; CQ, 9/28/21]

April 2021: Miller-Meeks Sponsored A Bill Requiring Research On Medical Cannabis For Veterans

April 2021: Miller-Meeks Sponsored A Bill Requiring Research On Medical Cannabis For Veterans. On April 30, 2021, Miller-Meeks sponsored HR 2932, the Veterans CARE Act, which “requires the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) to conduct and support research on the efficacy and safety of certain forms of cannabis and cannabis delivery for veterans enrolled in the VA health care system and diagnosed with conditions such as chronic pain or post-traumatic stress disorder.” The bill was read twice and referred to House Veterans' Affairs. [HR 2932, Sponsored, 4/30/21; CQ, 4/30/21]

Miller-Meeks Was Supportive Of Harm Reduction Policy, Recognized By Iowa Harm Reduction Coalition

Miller-Meeks Was Supportive Of Harm Reduction Policy And Was Named Legislator Of The Year By Iowa Harm Reduction Coalition For Her Effort To Help Medicaid Patients Access Drug Treatment. “For many years, Republicans have been hesitant to embrace harm reduction, the policymaking philosophy that emphasizes health and safety over criminalization. State Sen. Mariannette Miller-Meeks — who is seeking the GOP nomination in Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District — is a promising example of the changing landscape. This month, Miller-Meeks and state Rep. Ann Meyer, R-Fort Dodge, were honored as legislators of the year by the Iowa Harm Reduction Coalition, recognized for their efforts to make substance abuse treatment more accessible for Medicaid patients, which makes the process more efficient for both patients and the state government. As a doctor, Miller-Meeks takes an evidence-based approach to public policy questions, seeking input from a wide range of constituents and professionals.” [The Gazette, Adam Sullivan Op-Ed, 10/15/19]

• Miller-Meeks: “When It Comes To Harm Reduction, There’s Drug Policy, There’s Law Enforcement Policy, There’s Criminal Justice And There’s Health Policy.” “Miller-Meeks is not a doctrinaire drug reformer or a radical libertarian like me. As a doctor, she takes a evidence-based approach to public policy questions, seeking input from a wide range of constituents and professionals. ‘When it comes to harm
reduction, there’s drug policy, there’s law enforcement policy, there’s criminal justice and there’s health policy,” Miller-Meeks told me in an phone interview last week. ‘I think we can all agree there are reforms in the criminal justice system that need to be made. Looking at low-level possession — should that be a criminal offense?’” [The Gazette, Adam Sullivan Op-Ed, 10/15/19]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Iowa Harm Reductionists Who Praised Miller-Meeks Sought To Legalize Needle Exchange Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Sullivan Op-Ed: A Goal “Of Iowa Harm Reductionists In Recent Years Has Been Legal Needle Exchange Programs, Which Offer Clean Supplies To People Who Use Intravenous Drugs.” “One of the main goals of Iowa harm reductionists in recent years has been legal needle exchange programs, which offer clean supplies to people who use intravenous drugs and are proven to prevent the spread of infectious disease. While at least one Iowa organization provides clean syringes to drug users, Iowa is among the minority of states where that is illegal. Bills to change that have made some progress in the Iowa Legislature, but haven’t been passed.” [The Gazette, Adam Sullivan Op-Ed, 10/15/19]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violence Against Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2021: Miller-Meeks Voted For Reauthorizing The Violence Against Women Act For Five Years, Expanding Protections For Survivors Of Domestic Abuse And Stalking

Miller-Meeks Voted For Reauthorizing The Violence Against Women Act. In March 2021, Miller-Meeks voted for: “Passage of the bill, as amended, that would reauthorize programs enacted under the Violence Against Women Act through fiscal 2026. It would also expand a number of these programs and other programs and policies aimed at addressing and assisting victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual violence, stalking and sex trafficking.” The bill passed 244 to 172. [HR 1620, Vote #86, 3/17/21; CQ, 3/17/21]

The Bill Was Opposed By The NRA Because Of Provisions To Prevent People Convicted Of Domestic Abuse And Stalking From Purchasing Guns

VAWA Reauthorization Closed “Boyfriend Loophole” Allowing Convicted Abusers And Stalkers To Purchase Guns, Drawing Opposition From The National Rifle Association. “The U.S. House voted 244-172 Wednesday to reauthorize the expired Violence Against Women Act with a gun-reform provision by Michigan U.S. Rep. Debbie Dingell that has drawn the ire of the National Rifle Association […] It aims to close the so-called ‘boyfriend’ loophole by amending federal law to prohibit convicted abusers of current or former dating partners from purchasing or owning firearms. Currently, those convicted of domestic abuse can lose their weapons only if their victim is their current or former spouse, or they have a child with the victim. Dingell’s provision also would prohibit firearm ownership by people convicted of misdemeanor stalking. The NRA opposes the legislation over the provision, arguing there are no ‘loopholes’ for domestic violence or stalking, and that the legal system has sufficient protections to prohibit dangerous individuals from possessing firearms. The gun owners group has said ‘former dating partners’ is a subjective term that could be abused and noted that some misdemeanor stalking offenses don't include violent or threatening behavior or even personal contact. The NRA also fought the Dingell provision when the House reauthorized the bill in 2019, when the legislation died in the Republican-led Senate.” [Detroit News, 3/17/21]

Miller-Meeks Voted For Adding An Amendment To Extend The Violence Against Women Act Only For Only One Year, Instead Of Five

Miller-Meeks Voted For An Amendment Reducing The Length Of The Reauthorization Of The Violence Against Women Act. In March 2021, Miller-Meeks voted for: “Stefanik, R-N.Y., amendment no. 36 that would replace the bill’s provisions with language to reauthorize funding for programs and activities under the Violence Against Women Act through fiscal 2022.” The amendment was rejected by a vote of 177-249. [HR 1620, Vote #85, 3/17/21; CQ, 3/17/21]
**Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Family Violence Prevention Act**

**Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Family Violence Prevention Act.** In October 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against: “Passage of the bill, as amended, that would reauthorize and modify programs to address domestic, dating and family violence under the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act. It would authorize $328 million annually through fiscal 2026 for new and existing programs, including $26 million for grants to state coalitions to support local and culturally specific violence prevention efforts; $14 million for the National Domestic Violence Hotline and $4 million for a new National Native American Domestic Violence Hotline; $10 million for new grants to organizations serving underserved populations; and $3.5 million for research and evaluation activities. Among other provisions, it would prohibit discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity in programs funded by state formula grants. It would require the Government Accountability Office to conduct a study and issue a report, within two years of enactment, on federal programs for violence survivors, including to analyze gaps in such programs and steps taken to ensure survivors have access to programs that support their financial stability.” The bill passed by a vote of 228 to 200. [HR 1219, Vote #336, 10/26/21; CQ, 10/26/21]

**2013: Miller-Meeks Said Iowa Received About $142 Million From Federal Government, But Faced A $65,000 Cut For Education Programs To Stop Violence Against Women**

**Miller-Meeks Said Iowa Received About $142 Million From Federal Government, But Faced A $65,000 Cut For Education Programs To Stop Violence Against Women.** “On the public health front, Iowa could lose $90,000 for vaccines for low-income children, $670,000 to prevent and treat substance abuse, $65,000 for education programs to stop violence against women, and $220,000 for meals for senior citizens, among other cuts, according to a White House analysis. As cuts are spread among the agencies with whom the state contracts, ‘there will be some effect, but how great an effect is unknown,’ said Public Health Director Mariannette Miller-Meeks.” [Des Moines Register, 2/28/13]

**Child Abuse Prevention**

**2021: Miller-Meeks Voted For Extending Funding For Child Abuse Prevention Programs Through 2027**

**2021: Miller-Meeks Voted For Extending Funding For Child Abuse Prevention Programs Through 2027.** In March 2021, Miller-Meeks voted for: “Scott, D-Va., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill that would extend through fiscal 2027 the programs and authorities under the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act. For fiscal 2022, it would authorize $270 million for Health and Human Services Department grants to states for development and operations of certain child protective service programs and $270 million for HHS grants for community-based programs to prevent child abuse and neglect. It would authorize such sums as may be necessary through fiscal 2027 for both grant programs and make a number of modifications to grant program requirements and administration. It would also authorize $40 million for fiscal 2022 and such sums as may be necessary through fiscal 2027 for HHS activities to support adoption and foster care programs.” The motion was agreed to by a vote of 345-73. [HR 485, Vote #81, 3/16/21; CQ, 3/16/21]

**Ransomware Attacks**

**2019: Miller-Meeks Voted For A Bill Prohibiting Use Of Tax Dollars For Payment To People Responsible For Ransomware Attacks**

**2019: Miller-Meeks Voted For A Bill Prohibiting Use Of Tax Dollars For Payment To People Responsible For Ransomware Attacks.** Miller-Meeks voted for SF 2391, “a bill for an act prohibiting the state or a political subdivision of the state from expending revenue received from taxpayers for payment to persons responsible for
ransomware attacks, and including effective date provisions.” The bill passed by vote 28-17. [Iowa State Legislature, SF 2391, 3/11/20]

### Victims

#### 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted For Expanding Funding Sources For The Justice Department Crime Victims Fund

Miller-Meeks Voted For Expanding Funding Sources For The Justice Department Crime Victims Fund. In March 2021, Miller-Meeks voted for: “Nadler, D-N.Y., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended, that would expand funding sources for the Justice Department Crime Victims Fund to include funds from deferred prosecution agreements and non-prosecution agreements. It would increase from 60% to 75% the amount of grant funding provided to states for victim compensation programs and prohibit the department from requiring such programs to deduct recovery costs or restitution collections when calculating funds awarded. It would also authorize states to waive a fund matching requirement for grant recipients during and for one year after the end of a pandemic-related national emergency, or if the state establishes a policy for programs to request and receive a waiver.” The motion passed 384-38. [H Res 1652, Vote #89, 3/17/21; CQ, 3/17/21]

### Sports Wagering

#### 2019: Miller-Meeks Voted For Sports Wagering

2019: Miller-Meeks Voted For Sports Wagering. Miller-Meeks voted for SF 617, “a bill for an act relating to gambling regulation and wagering, by providing for sports wagering and fantasy sports contests, providing for taxes and fees, making penalties applicable, and including implementation and effective date provisions.” The bill passed by vote 31-18. [Iowa State Legislature, SF 617, 4/27/19]
State Issues

**Significant Findings**

  - Iowa Attorney General Tom Miller had joined multistate lawsuits challenging Trump administration policies on family separation, DACA, the Clean Power Plan, and protections for nursing home residents and students at for-profit colleges.
- 2019: Miller-Meeks voted to increase the number of gubernatorial appointments to the state judicial nominating commission in Iowa.

**Attorney General**

**2019: Miller-Meeks Voted For Prohibiting The Iowa Attorney General From Joining Out-Of-State Lawsuits**

2019: Miller-Meeks voted for SF 615, “a bill for an Attorney General’s statutory duties to require the approval of the Governor, Executive Council, or Legislature to prosecute any action or proceeding, including signing onto or authoring amicus briefs or letters of support, in any court or tribunal other than an Iowa state court.” The bill passed by vote 32-18. [Iowa State Legislature, SF 615, 4/15/19]

**Iowa Attorney General Tom Miller Had Joined Multistate Lawsuits Challenging Trump Administration Policies On Immigration And Other Issues**

2018: Iowa Attorney General Tom Miller joined a multistate lawsuit challenging the Trump administration’s policy of forced family separation on the U.S. southern border. A total of 16 other states and the District of Columbia joined the lawsuit, filed today in the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Washington. Miller argued that the policy harms Iowa's interests in maintaining families and prohibiting discrimination. "The State of Iowa has a longstanding policy that favors the protection of the family unit," Miller said in the complaint. "The State of Iowa only separates parents and children in the most exceptional of circumstances because when we do so we 'inflict a unique deprivation of a constitutionally protected liberty interest.'" [Iowa Attorney General, 6/26/18]


HEADLINE: “Iowa Joins Multistate Lawsuit Against U.S. Department Of Education For Refusing To Enforce Gainful Employment Rule.” [Iowa Attorney General, 10/16/17]

HEADLINE: “Miller Joins Lawsuit To Block Census Bureau From Demanding Citizenship Information.” [Iowa Attorney General, 4/3/18]

HEADLINE: “Attorney General Miller Joins 27-Member Coalition Defending Clean Power Plan.” [Iowa Attorney General, 4/27/18]
HEADLINE: “Miller, 17 Attorneys General Oppose Rolling Back Protections For Nursing Home Residents.” [Iowa Attorney General, 5/31/18]

**Judicial Nominations**

| 2019: Miller-Meeks Voted To Increase The Number Of Gubernatorial Appointments To The State Judicial Nominating Commission In Iowa |

**2019: Miller-Meeks Voted For SF 638, Which Concerned State Regulatory Matters.** Miller-Meeks voted for SF 638, “A bill for an act relating to state and local finances by making appropriations, providing for legal and regulatory responsibilities, providing for other properly related matters, and including effective date, applicability, and retroactive applicability provisions.” The bill passed 32-16. [Iowa State Legislature, SF 638, 4/27/19]

- **SF 638 Increased The Number Of Gubernatorial Appointments To The State Judicial Nominating Commission.** “SENATE FILE 638 - State and Local Government and Regulatory Matters — Appropriations and Miscellaneous Changes […] This division increases the number of commissioners that the Governor appoints to the State Judicial Nominating Commission (SJNC) from eight to nine. Appointees must be chosen without reference to political affiliation.” [Iowa Legislative Services Agency, 6/19]

**2019: Miller-Meeks Voted In Favor Of Amending Iowa’s Judicial Nominating Commission Selection.** Miller-Meeks voted for SF 237, “a bill for an act relating to the membership and procedures of the state judicial nominating commission and district judicial nominating commission and to the selection and qualifications of judges, associate judges, and the chief justice, and including effective date provisions. (Formerly SSB 1101.)” The bill effective passed by vote 32-17. [Iowa State Legislature, SF 237, 3/12/19]
## Seniors’ Issues

### Significant Findings

- **2021:** Miller-Meeks said she opposed allowing Medicare to negotiate lower prescription drug prices, then claimed a month later that she was “still working” on “lowering prescription drug prices.”

- **2021:** Miller-Meeks falsely claimed that government involvement in drug pricing would lead to rationing of care and restricted access to certain medications.

- **December 2021:** Miller-Meeks voted against measures to raise the debt limit hours before the United States would have defaulted, threatening $20 billion in Social Security payments for seniors.

- **2021:** Miller-Meeks also voted against legislation preventing Medicare cuts, saying the bill was a “short-term fix” and complaining it was tied to the debt limit.

- **2012:** Miller-Meeks supported a plan to turn Medicare into a voucher program, agreeing that a premium support plan “may not be politically correct, but it is medically correct.”

  - The program Miller-Meeks supported would end Medicare as we know it, giving Medicare recipients a fixed dollar amount to buy insurance on the private marketplace.

- **2009:** Miller-Meeks blamed Medicare funding shortfalls on overuse, arguing seniors who received coverage through Medicare were prone to use it unnecessarily, like patients with sore throats who would otherwise gargle with salt water instead of seeing a doctor.

- **2008:** Miller-Meeks supported partial privatization of Social Security, indicating she supported placing some Social Security funds in private accounts that she believed could earn a better return than the government’s typical 3% gain.

- **2008-2020:** Miller-Meeks repeatedly expressed support for raising the Social Security retirement age.

- **2020:** Miller-Meeks called for a federal balanced budget amendment, which would raise problems for the operation of Social Security.

- **2021:** Miller-Meeks voted against the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act, a bill increasing protections against age discrimination in the workplace.

- **2021:** Miller-Meeks voted against the Protect Older Job Applicants Act.

## Medicare

### 2021: Miller-Meeks Said She Opposed Allowing Medicare To Negotiate Lower Prescription Drug Prices, But Claimed A Month Later She Was “Still Working” On Lowering Drug Prices

**Miller-Meeks Said She Opposed Allowing Medicare To Negotiate Lower Prescription Drug Prices.**

“Republican Congresswoman Mariannette Miller-Meeks of Ottumwa says she’s opposed to having the federal government negotiate to lower the prices of prescription medicine covered by Medicare. Democrats have inserted
this proposal in a bill that may be voted upon today.” [Radio Iowa, 11/5/21]


Retired Physician David Sands Op-Ed: By Opposing Allowing Medicare To Negotiate Drug Prices, Miller-Meeks Was “Hurting Iowans And People Across The Country For Strictly Political Purposes.” “Dr. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, who is my representative in Congress, uses Republican talking points to justify an utterly untenable position against allowing Medicare to negotiate prices with pharmaceutical companies. I am also a physician (retired) and I have to call out Miller-Meeks for hurting Iowans and people across the country for strictly political purposes.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, David Sands, 11/22/21]

Miller-Meeks Compared Medicare Negotiating Drug Prices To The Afghanistan Withdrawal And That “If You Think That It Went Just Swimmingly, Then Of Course You Want President Biden And His Team To Negotiate Prices For You On Drugs.” MILLER-MEEKS: “If I may, an example of that is, look at the Afghanistan withdrawal. And so, if you think that it went just swimmingly, then of course you want President Biden and his team to negotiate prices for you on drugs. If you don't think it went very well, then maybe we need to rethink how much of the government we want controlling that.” [YouTube, Kevin McCarthy, 11/5/21] (VIDEO) 00:29:15

December 2021: Miller-Meeks Said She Was “Still Working” On “Lowering Prescription Drug Prices.” “MILLER-MEEKS: We’re still working on prescription, lowering prescription drug prices. So I think, given the things that I’ve done, I expect to be reelected and by a much larger margin that six votes.” [YouTube, Iowa Press, 12/17/21] (VIDEO) 00:06:19

2021: Miller-Meeks Falsely Claimed That Government Involvement In Drug Pricing Would Lead To Rationing Of Care And Restricted Access To Medications

Miller-Meeks Said Allowing The Government To Control Drug Prices Would Lead To “Rationing Of Care” And Access To Prescription Drugs Based On “How Valuable Your Life Is.” MILLER-MEEKS: “And that is that in countries where there is government control of pricing, and there is that disparity, they also utilize your access to drugs or medications or surgery through a lens of quality-adjusted life years. And so, what this does—and think about this, if you have a child who's born with a rare disease, or a debilitating disease, or you're an individual that develops a cancer and you're at 70 years old, rather than 30 years old, the government that is going to determine your access to care by what they value your life. And so, if you're a senior citizen, the value of your life is less than if you were a young adult, and in the United States, are we ready to have—in essence, this is rationing of care. It's not, you know, it is not a scare tactic. This is precisely what will be done on the basis of how valuable your life is. And constitutionally, we know that we don't have any second-class citizens. But this sets us up to divide Americans apart into whose life is more valuable, so who gets access to treatment and who gets access to drugs, and I think it is such a discriminatory practice.” [YouTube, Kevin McCarthy, 11/5/21] (VIDEO) 00:37:46

KFF: Claims That Medicare Drug Price Negotiation Would Restrict Access To Certain Medicines Were “Not Accurate.” “The pharmaceutical industry’s latest ad campaign claims that drug price negotiation would ‘restrict access to medicines in Medicare’ by removing ‘a provision that protects access to medicines’ and that patients ‘would be stuck with whatever medicines the government says you can have.’ Another drug industry ad says that allowing the government to negotiate drug prices means ‘politicians…[will] decide which medicines you can and can’t get.’ This is not accurate. In fact, the proposed drug price negotiation program does not authorize the federal government to decide which medications people on Medicare can and cannot get and does not establish or require a particular prescription drug formulary. Insurers that offer Medicare prescription drug plans would continue to make decisions about which drugs to cover, or not, subject to protections provided under current law and regulations. The legislation under consideration leaves in place the non-interference clause and its specific restrictions with the exception of the proposed drug price negotiation program. Under this program, the negotiation process would not apply to most prescription drugs, instead focusing on a relatively small number with the highest spending and lacking generic or biosimilar competitors.” [KFF, 10/7/21]
2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Legislation Preventing Medicare Cuts, Saying The Bill Was A “Short-Term Fix”

December 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Preventing Sequestration Cuts To Medicare And Establishing Procedures To Expedite Senate Consideration Of A Debt Limit Increase. On December 7, 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against the “Passage of the bill, as amended, that would extend from Dec. 31, 2021, to March 31, 2022, a temporary suspension of the 2 percent annual sequester of Medicare payments, and provide for payment reductions of 1 percent for the period of April 1 through June 30, 2022. As an offset, it would increase sequestration percentages above 2 percent in fiscal 2030. It would also require budget year debit for 2022 to be rolled over to the 2033 scorecards under statutory pay-as-you-go requirements, thus delaying spending cuts to Medicare and other mandatory programs subject to sequestration that would otherwise be triggered in January. It would delay a number of other Medicare payment reductions and policies, including to extend a temporary increase in payment amounts for physicians to provide a 3 percent increase for services furnished in 2022; delay for one year a provision that would phase in payment reductions for clinical diagnostic laboratory tests, prohibiting any reductions for 2021 and 2022 and prohibiting reductions greater than 15 percent for 2023 through 2025; and delay through 2022 the implementation of the Medicare radiation oncology model. It would decrease from $165 million to $101 million funding that may be expended from the Medicare Improvement Fund for fiscal 2021. Finally, the bill would establish procedures to expedite Senate consideration of a joint resolution to increase the debt limit by a specific dollar amount. Specifically, it would provide for a non-debatable motion to proceed to the joint resolution and, if the motion is agreed to, up to 10 hours of debate on the measure with no amendments or other motions in order, immediately followed by a vote on passage. Such procedures would be valid for consideration of one joint resolution by Jan. 16, 2022.” Passed by a vote of 222-212. [S. 610, Vote 404, 12/7/21; CQ, 12/7/21]

- Miller-Meeks Said She Voted Against Preventing Medicare Cuts Because Democrats Chose “A Short-Term Fix” And “Directly Tied It To A Debt Limit Increase.” “Today, December 7th, 2021, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02) released the following statement after voting NO on an inadequate fix to Medicare sequestration: ‘Today, I voted no on the Democrat majority’s heavy-handed decision to play political games with Americans’ healthcare and businesses. Medicare patients need and deserve access to quality care and providers. After months of fair negotiations, the majority has chosen a short-term fix to Medicare sequestration and has directly tied it to a debt limit increase. Ensuring patients have access to care and that there are options for quality providers needs to be a top priority. Instead of kicking the can down the road, Congress should be staying in Washington until a long-term bipartisan solution is agreed upon to avoid cuts to Medicare. These political games are unacceptable and the American people deserve better. I look forward to working with my colleagues to address this issue in a permanent and constructive manner.’” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 12/7/21]

2020: 39,257 Residents Of Iowa’s 2nd District Received Some Medicare Benefits

2020: 39,257 Residents Of Miller-Meeks’ District Received Medicare Benefits. [Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, 2020 Congressional District Report]

2012: Miller-Meeks Supported Voucher Plan for Medicare

Miller-Meeks Supported Voucher Plan for Medicare. According to Miller-Meeks twitter, she stated “Agree! RT @texmed: Alabama Dr. Jeff Terry: Medicare premium support “may not be politically correct, but it is medically correct.” #AMAmtg” [@miller-meeks, Twitter, 6/17/12]
The Program Miller-Meeks Supported Would Replace Medicare Insurance Coverage By Giving Medicare Recipients A Fixed Dollar Amount To Buy Insurance On The Private Marketplace

The Miller-Meeks’ Supported Program Would Replace Medicare Insurance Coverage By Giving Medicare Recipients A Fixed Dollar Amount To Buy Insurance On The Private Marketplace. “The ad also references a tweet Miller-Meeks made supporting a Medicare Premium Support program in Paul Ryan's 2012 budget proposal. That program would replace Medicare insurance coverage by giving Medicare recipients a fixed dollar amount to buy insurance on the private marketplace. The Congressional Budget Office released a report in 2013 that looked at two models for a premium support program. Depending on the model used, the report showed costs to beneficiaries could rise 11 percent or fall 6 percent. Both models showed a net savings in taxpayer spending on Medicare. [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 10/4/14]

2009: Miller-Meeks Questioned The Need To Provide Current Levels Of Medicare Benefits If It Required Increasing Taxes

Miller-Meeks: “Just Like Fannie Mae And Freddie Mac, It's A Government-Sponsored Entity […] If Medicare Is Underfunded, In Order To Provide The Current Level Of Benefits That We Provide To Seniors, Then How Much Taxation Do People Want To Pay For That?” “Miller-Meeks, however, says that's a false argument. She said insurance companies have to worry about a bottom line, whereas the government can increase taxes. ‘Just like Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, it's a government-sponsored entity,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘If Medicare is underfunded, in order to provide the current level of benefits that we provide to seniors, then how much taxation do people want to pay for that?’” [The Hawk Eye (Burlington, Iowa), 9/6/09]

Miller-Meeks: “The Mere Fact That We Have Insurance Causes Costs To Rise.” “Providers in the healthcare system see this all the time, when someone else is paying the bill, you purchase things that you would not have when you are paying for them out of your own pocket. So the mere fact that we have insurance causes costs to rise. In addition to that, as consumers and constituents, we've asked our legislators within our states to add on more benefits to our health insurance.” [Mariannette Miller Meeks Conversation on Health Care, 9/4/09]

Miller-Meeks Blamed Medicare Funding Shortfalls On Overuse, Saying Seniors With Sore Throats Should Gargle Salt Water Rather Than Use The Health Care System Unnecessarily

Miller-Meeks Blamed Medicare Funding Shortfalls On “Overuse, Saying Those Who Get Care For Free Are Prone To Use It Unnecessarily Like Patients With Mild Sore Throats Who'd Otherwise Would Gargle With Salt Water.” “Mariannette Miller-Meeks, a nonpracticing ophthalmologist in Ottumwa, agrees with the ideal of health care for all, but says the proposed legislation doesn't do accomplish that task. […] To begin tackling the myriad problems of the current health care system, Miller-Meeks proposes changing Medicare reimbursement, something finds support with Maharry and much of Iowa's federal delegation. Blocking that, though, are the more populous states have more representatives in Congress who support status quo. Compounding the problem, the Medicare fund is running out of money. Miller-Meeks blames the bankruptcy on overuse, saying those who get care for free are prone to use it unnecessarily like patients with mild sore throats who'd otherwise would gargle with salt water.” [The Hawk Eye (Burlington, Iowa), 9/6/09]
Miller-Meeks Blamed The Rise Of Health Care Costs On Medicare Overuse. “Two words, competition and insurance. If you look at the cost of health care in the United States, the rapid rise began in 1970. And the rise in health care costs exceeded inflation. This is because Medicare was instituted in 1965. As seniors became more adept at utilizing the Medicare system to pay for care that they previously had not accessed, the cost escalated. We also know from numerous health care studies [...] show that when someone doesn't bear the cost of health care, they utilize more. So overutilization began to be the norm.” [Mariannette Miller Meeks Conversation on Health Care, 00:00:28, 9/4/09] (VIDEO)

2009: Miller-Meeks Appeared To Support Phasing Out The Funding Stream For Medicare And Social Security

Miller-Meeks Said The Government Could Gradually Phase Out The Employer Deduction. “The problem with that, Miller-Meeks admits, is that each state has different coverage requirements. So she proposes ending that practice and requiring coverage just for the three things she believes people fear most. Miller-Meeks said the government also could gradually phase out employer deduction but offer individuals the same deduction so they could choose their best means of care.” [The Hawk Eye (Burlington, Iowa), 9/6/09]

- The Employer Deduction Funds Social Security And Medicare. “The current tax rate for social security is 6.2% for the employer and 6.2% for the employee, or 12.4% total. The current rate for Medicare is 1.45% for the employer and 1.45% for the employee, or 2.9% total. Refer to Publication 15, (Circular E), Employer's Tax Guide for more information; or Publication 51, (Circular A), Agricultural Employer’s Tax Guide for agricultural employers.” [IRS, 2/14/20]

2010: Miller-Meeks Supported Cutting “Spending And Root Out Well Known And Documented Waste In Entitlement Programs Like Medicare And Medicaid”

Miller-Meeks Supported Cutting “Spending And Root Out Well Known And Documented Waste In Entitlement Programs Like Medicare And Medicaid.” According to Miller-Meeks for Congress 2010 website under “Cut Spending, Cut Government Waste”, Miller-Meeks stated “while both Republicans and Democrats are responsible for years of past budget deficits, together, we must be the solution for future generations who will inherit this massive legacy of debt. We need to enact a balanced budget amendment, afford the President line-item veto authority, cut spending and root out well known and documented waste in entitlement programs like Medicare and Medicaid which add up to tens of billions of dollars every single year.” [Miller-Meeks for Congress 2010, accessed 6/15/20]

2008: Miller-Meeks Wanted To Raise Iowa’s Medicare Reimbursement Rate

2008: Miller-Meeks Wanted To Raise Iowa’s Medicare Reimbursement Rate. “Miller-Meeks said she wants to raise Iowa’s Medicare reimbursement rate and move health care coverage to a free-market, consumer driven system.” [The Hawk Eye, 5/27/08]

Miller-Meeks: “I Will Fight To Preserve/Protect [Medicare] In Congress”

Miller-Meeks: “I Will Fight To Preserve/Protect The Program In Congress.” According to Dr. Miller-Meeks twitter account, Miller-Meeks stated “Today we celebrate Medicare's 49th Anniversary - a promise we made to our seniors. I will fight to preserve/protect the program in Congress.” [Dr. Miller-Meeks Twitter, 7/30/14]
**Social Security**

2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Measures To Raise The Debt Limit Hours Before The United States Would Have Defaulted, Threatening $20 Billion In Social Security Payments For Seniors…

**December 2021:** Miller-Meeks Voted Against Raising The Debt Limit By $2.5 Trillion. On December 14, 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against the “Passage of the resolution that would increase the statutory limit on federal debt by $2.5 trillion.” The bill passed by a vote of 221-209. [S. J. Res. 33, Vote 449, 12/15/21; CQ, 12/15/21]

- **HEADLINE:** “House Passes Debt Ceiling Increase, Sending It To Biden To Avoid Default Hours Before Deadline.” [CNBC, 12/15/21]

- Congress Passed A Debt Limit Increase Early The Day The Debt Limit Would Have Been Reached. “Congress early Wednesday voted to raise the nation's debt limit by $2.5 trillion, officially staving off default and the economic peril that would come if the U.S. were unable to pay its bills. […] Lawmakers managed to get the measure passed just in time to avoid an economic scare. Treasury Secretary Janet Yellen told lawmakers she estimated the United States would reach its debt ceiling by Wednesday. If lawmakers didn't address the debt limit by then, the U.S. would have defaulted on its debts for the first time, which could lead to a global recession, Treasury Department officials and experts said.” [USA Today, 12/15/21]

- **Washington Post:** Failing To Raise The Debt Limit Threatened $20 Billion In Social Security Payments For Seniors. “If Congress fails to increase the debt limit, Treasury would be unable to pay debts as they come due. Treasury Secretary Janet L. Yellen said earlier this week that such a default would be unprecedented in U.S. history. Moody’s ‘best estimate’ is that this date is Oct. 20, although Treasury has not given a more precise day. At that point, Treasury officials would face excruciating choices, such as whether to fail to pay $20 billion owed to seniors on Social Security, or to fail to pay bondholders of U.S. debt — a decision that could undermine faith in U.S. credit and permanently drive federal borrowing costs higher.” [Washington Post, 9/21/21]

**October 2021:** Miller-Meeks Voted Against A Resolution To Concur In A Senate Amendment Of The Debt Limit Suspension Bill. On October 12, 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against the “Adoption of the resolution (H Res 716) that would provide for floor consideration of the Family Violence Prevention and Services Improvement Act (HR 2119), the Providing Urgent Maternal Protections for Nursing Mothers (PUMP) for Nursing Mothers Act (HR 3110) and the Protect Older Job Applicants (POJA) Act (HR 3992). It would provide for floor consideration of eight amendments to HR 2119; two amendments to HR 3110; and two amendments to HR 3992, as well as up to one hour of general debate on each bill. It would also provide for automatic agreement to a motion to concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the debt limit suspension bill (S 1301).” [CQ, 10/12/21; H. Res. 716, Vote 315, 10/12/21]

**September 2021:** Miller-Meeks Voted Against A Bill To Raise The Debt Ceiling Through December 2022. On September 21, 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against the “Passage of the bill that would provide funding for federal government operations and services through Dec. 3, 2021, at fiscal 2021 levels; provide emergency funding for natural disaster relief and Afghan evacuee assistance; and suspend the statutory limit on federal debt through Dec. 16, 2022.” [CQ, 9/21/21; H.R. 5305, Vote 267, 9/21/21]
Miller-Meeks Joined A Letter Opposing Any Effort To Raise The Debt Ceiling. “U.S. Reps. Randy Feenstra, R-Iowa, and Mariannette Miller-Meeks, R-Iowa, joined over 100 of their colleagues in signing an open letter to the American people, opposing any effort by congressional Democrats to raise the debt ceiling. Last month, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimated Congress will need to raise the debt limit by October or November. Negotiations to raise the debt ceiling have historically been bipartisan, but as the letter states, Democrats control Congress and the White House, and have used this as an opportunity to pass trillions of dollars in unprecedented spending.” [Iowa Torch, 9/2/21]

… Despite Campaigning On Protecting The Financial Security Of Social Security Beneficiaries

2020: Miller-Meeks’ Campaign Spokesman Said Miller-Meeks “Is Not Going To Support Any Legislation That Will Jeopardize” The Financial Security Of Social Security Beneficiaries. “Miller-Meeks’ campaign said she will fight to strengthen and protect Social Security and Medicare. ‘Rita Hart is using the same old, tired scare tactic about Social Security and Medicare that we hear from Democrats every election year,’ campaign spokesman Eric Woolson said in an emailed statement. ‘Mariannette Miller-Meeks knows what it’s like to grow up in a poor family that struggles to make ends meet. She knows that Social Security is a safety net and a lifeline for millions of Americans, including members of her own family and many friends. She is not going to support any legislation that will jeopardize their financial security.’” [Quad-City Times, 9/16/20]

122,943 Retired Workers In Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District Received $190,303,000 In Total Monthly Medicare Benefits

2020: 166,364 Individuals In Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District Were Medicare Beneficiaries. [Social Security Administration, accessed 1/7/22]

- 2020: 130,157 Seniors In Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District Were Medicare Beneficiaries. [Social Security Administration, accessed 1/7/22]

- 2020: 122,943 Retirees In Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District Were Medicare Beneficiaries. [Social Security Administration, accessed 1/7/22]

2020: Medicare Beneficiaries In Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District Received $238,713,000 In Total Monthly Benefits. [Social Security Administration, accessed 1/7/22]

- 2020: Retired Workers In Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District Received $190,303,000 In Total Monthly Medicare Benefits. [Social Security Administration, accessed 1/7/22]

Miller-Meeks Repeatedly Supported Looking At Raising The Retirement Age To Ease The Strain On The Social Security System

WHO 13 Des Moines: “On Money Matters, Republican Mariannette Miller-Meeks Supports Looking At Raising The Retirement Age To Ease The Strain On The Social Security System.” “On money matters, Republican Mariannette Miller-Meeks supports looking at raising the retirement age to ease the strain on the Social Security system. Democrat Rita Hart doesn’t. Hart wants to raise the federal minimum wage but didn’t say by how much. Miller-Meeks thinks the states should determine the minimum wage. Miller-Meeks said, ‘A minimum wage is…and I started out 30 cents an hour…so a minimum wage is an entry-level. It’s not supposed to be a wage or was not meant to be a wage that is supposed to support a family.’” [WHO 13 Des Moines, 9/25/20]

2014: Miller-Meeks Said Future Solutions For Benefits Could Include The Possibility Of Raising The Federal Retirement Age. “Miller-Meeks, an eye surgeon and former director of the Iowa Department of Public Health, in a prior run for the seat in 2014, said for the U.S. to prevent sharp breaks in the benefit or tax levels faced
by succeeding generations, solutions could include the possibility of raising the federal retirement age of 65.” [Quad-City Times, 9/16/20]

2010: Miller-Meeks Supported Raising The Federal Retirement Age. “Miller-Meeks said the United States must recognize that there is a risk of backlash from young workers if they come to the conclusion they pay for the benefits and programs geared toward older Americans but will not have similar benefits after they retire. Her solution is not to cut existing benefits but to take steps to adjust the situation to prevent the costs from overwhelming the future workforce. That includes stopping the federal government from raiding accounts like the Social Security trust fund for unrelated projects and the possibility of raising the federal retirement age. ‘We cannot keep asking more and more of younger people for programs that politicians have guaranteed for older Americans,’ Miller-Meeks said.” [Ottumwa Courier, 8/25/10]

2008: Miller-Meeks Supported Raising The Retirement Age. According to a 2008 Project Vote Smart questionnaire, Miller-Meeks supported raising the retirement age for individual eligibility to receive full Social Security benefits. [Vote Smart, Accessed 6/22/20]

2020: Miller-Meeks Called For A Federal Balanced Budget Amendment, Which Would Raise Problems For The Operation Of Social Security

Miller-Meeks: “We Have A Balanced Budget Amendment In The State Of Iowa And I Think There Should Be A Balanced Budget Amendment At The Federal Level.” “Miller-Meeks fielded questions from business representatives on a variety of topics. (Hart will have a similar session at 10 a.m. Oct. 22). The sessions were arranged by the Partnership, Young Professionals Connection and the Greater Des Moines Leadership Institute. […] ‘I do not agree with closing the economy to handle the pandemic. I think we need to learn from this. When it comes to handling the federal debt, you can either decrease spending, or you can increase revenue. I do think we need to look at our spending levels and where we spend money. Do we have a return on investment? Do the programs we have in place do what they were intended to do? Do they have an outcome? Do we heaven [sic] have an outcome measure? … We have a balanced budget amendment in the state of Iowa and I think there should be a balanced budget amendment at the federal level.’” [Iowa Capital Dispatch, 9/10/20]

CBPP: A Federal Balanced Budget Amendment Would “Threaten Significant Economic Harm” And “Raise A Host Of Problems For The Operation Of Social Security And Other Vital Federal Programs.” “A balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution would be an unusual and economically dangerous way to address the nation’s long-term fiscal problems. It would threaten significant economic harm, as explained below. It also would raise a host of problems for the operation of Social Security and other vital federal programs. It’s striking that the House Republican leadership intends to schedule a vote on a balanced budget amendment just a few months after the President and Congress enacted a tax cut that will increase deficits by as much as $2 trillion over the next decade.[1] The economic problems with such an amendment are the most serious. By requiring a balanced budget every year, no matter the state of the economy, such an amendment would raise serious risks of tipping weak economies into recession and making recessions longer and deeper, causing very large job losses. The amendment
would force policymakers to cut federal programs, raise taxes, or both when the economy is weak or already in recession — the exact opposite of what good economic policy would advise. That’s because the amendment would force policymakers to cut federal programs, raise taxes, or both when the economy is weak or already in recession — the exact opposite of what good economic policy would advise.” [Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, 3/16/18]

2008: Miller-Meeks Supported Privatizing Social Security

Miller-Meeks Supported “Some Sort Of Private, But Limited, Account For Some Of The [Social Security] Funds.” “Another large entitlement program that could use some help is Social Security, Miller-Meeks said. There are some simple solutions that can extend the life of the program. […] She also sees that it is difficult for congressmen to keep their hands off Social Security funds when money is needed elsewhere. For that reason, she supports some sort of private, but limited, account for some of the funds. She said the private account most likely could earn better than the 3 percent the government gains.” [Daily Democrat, 5/1/08]

2008: Miller-Meeks Supported Private Accounts. According to a 2008 Project Vote Smart questionnaire, Miller-Meeks supported allowing workers to invest a portion of their payroll tax on private accounts that they manage themselves. [Vote Smart, Accessed 6/22/20]

2014: Miller-Meeks Said She Would Protect Social Security

Miller-Meeks Said She Would Protect Social Security. “Both candidates said they would protect Social Security, although they argued about Loebsack’s record on Medicare. Miller-Meeks said he voted to cut Medicare more than once.” [The Quad-City Times, 10/12/14]

Miller-Meeks: “I Will Fight To Preserve And Protect Social Security To Help Current Retirees And Families Going Through Difficult Times.” “Mariannette Miller-Meeks, R: My husband’s father suffered for nearly a decade with prostate cancer that took a devastating toll on his family. After he passed away, survivors benefits through Social Security helped them make ends meet. In Congress, I will fight to preserve and protect Social Security to help current retirees and families going through difficult times. The challenge with the program is long-term solvency that needs to be addressed in a bipartisan way that should be above politics. We need to have an open dialogue about ways to preserve and protect the program for current and future retirees.” [Des Moines Register, 9/7/14]

Age Discrimination
2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act, A Bill Increasing Protections Against Age Discrimination In The Workplace

Miller-Meeks Voted Against Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act Of 2021. In June 2021, Miller-Meeks Voted Against: “Passage of the bill, as amended, that would specify a that adverse actions by an employer in which age was a motivating factor shall be considered unlawful under federal employment law regarding age discrimination. It would specify that a complaining party under such law would not be required to demonstrate that age was the sole motivating factor of an adverse action, thus effectively reversing the 2009 Supreme Court decision in Gross v. FBL Financial Services, Inc. It would establish the same standard of proof in the case of employment discrimination based on disability or retaliation against an employee who opposes unlawful employment practices or participates in investigations or litigations related to such practices. In age-based employment discrimination cases where a court determines that an adverse action would have been taken in the absence of age-based motivation, the bill would allow courts to grant declaratory or injunctive relief and attorneys fees, but prohibit courts from awarding damages or ordering reparative actions by the respondent. As amended, it would require the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to submit reports to Congress on the number of age discrimination in employment claims brought under the bill’s provisions; disparities faced by individuals with characteristics protected under existing anti-discrimination law in pursuing employment discrimination relief under the mixed-motive evidentiary standard; and the number of pending or filed claims by women impacted by age-based employment discrimination.” The bill passed, 247-178. [HR 2062, Vote #180, 6/23/21; CQ, 6/23/21]

- Miller-Meeks Voted For An Amendment To Delay Implementation Of The Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act Until A GAO Study Determined If SCOTUS Rulings Discouraged Individuals From Filing Age Discrimination Or Employment Retaliation Charges. In June 2021, Miller-Meeks Voted For: “Adoption of the Scott, D-Va., en bloc amendments no. 2 that would postpone the bill's effective date until the Government Accountability Office reports to Congress the results of a study determining whether Supreme Court decisions in 2009 and 2013 employment discrimination lawsuits have discouraged individuals from filing age discrimination or employment discrimination retaliation charges and cases with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and whether the success rate for such cases has decreased. It would prohibit the bill's provisions from taking effect if the study shows that such filings and success rates have not decreased. It would strike language that would allow mixed-motive retaliatory claims in which a complainant demonstrates that a protected characteristic under existing law was a motivating factor for any employment practice, even if other factors also motivated the practice.” The amendment was rejected, 182-243. [HR 2062, Vote #179, 6/23/21; CQ, 6/23/21]

2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Protect Older Job Applicants Act

November 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against A Bill To Prohibit Employers From Discriminating Against Job Applicants Based On Age. On November 4, 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against the “Passage of the bill, as amended, that would prohibit an employer from discriminating against a job applicant in a way that would deprive the job applicant of employment opportunities or otherwise adversely affect the applicant's status based on the applicant's age.” The bill passed by a vote of 224-200. [H.R. 3992, Vote 358, 11/4/21; CQ, 11/4/21]

November 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted For An Amendment To Delay The Effective Date Of The Protect Older Job Applicants Act Until A Study Was Conducted On Whether Allowing Applicants To File Disparate Impact Claims Had A Negative Impact On Such Applicants. On November 4, 2021, Miller-Meeks voted for the “Keller, R-Pa., amendment no. 2 that would delay the bill's effective date until the Government Accountability Office conducts a study and reports to Congress on whether not allowing job applicants to file disparate impact claims has a negative impact on such applicants. It would stipulate that the bill's provisions would not take effect if the study shows there is not a significant negative impact on such applicants.” The amendment was rejected by a vote of 197-228. [H.R. 3992, Vote 357, 11/4/21; CQ, 11/4/21]

November 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against An Amendment To Conduct A Study On Job Applicants’ Age Discrimination Claims. On November 4, 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against the “Pappas, D-N.H., amendment no. 1 that would require the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to conduct a study, within one enactment, to determine the number of pending or filed claims, including claims in closed cases, by individuals who may have been adversely impacted by age discrimination in the job application process. It would require the commission to submit to Congress and make publicly available a report on study results including recommendations for best practices to address age discrimination in the hiring process.” The amendment was adopted by a vote of 225-201. [H.R. 3992, Vote 356, 11/4/21; CQ, 11/4/21]
Tax Issues

**Significant Findings**

- Miller-Meeks campaigned in 2020 on preserving the 2017 Republican tax cuts.
- 2010: Miller-Meeks said she supported extending the Bush tax cuts.
- Miller-Meeks supported tax systems that benefitted the wealthy at the expense of the middle class.
  - Miller-Meeks said she wanted people to have the opportunity to choose a “Flat Tax,” which would be a windfall for the wealthy while increasing taxes on the middle class.
  - Ottumwa Courier: Miller-Meeks “voiced support for the ‘Fair Tax’ that even her own party’s experts acknowledge would be anything but fair to middle class Americans.”
- June 2021: Miller-Meeks said she did not want to raise taxes on corporations because “taxes on investment hurts all of us.”
  - Miller-Meeks repeatedly said she favored cuts to corporate income tax rates before TCJA became law.
- Miller-Meeks repeatedly argued against taxing the estates of multi-millionaires.
  - Miller-Meeks argued repealing stepped-up basis would “force heirs to sell all or parcels of farmland to pay large taxes on assets that they simply cannot afford to pay off.”
  - August 2021: Miller-Meeks tweeted “the death tax has hurt family farms across Iowa for years and doubling down on this will hurt them even more.”
  - 2012: Miller-Meeks said she liked the idea of abolishing the estate tax.
- October 2021: Miller-Meeks joined two bills and a letter to Biden opposing expansion of data collection or required reporting by the IRS.
- 2014: Miller-Meeks claimed the IRS was targeting conservative non-profits.
- September 2020: Miller-Meeks said an increase in the federal fuel tax was an option for funding infrastructure projects.

**Tax Cuts & Jobs Act**

**Miller-Meeks Campaigned In 2020 On Preserving The 2017 Republican Tax Cuts**

November 2020: Cedar Rapids Gazette Reported That Miller-Meeks Had Campaigned On Preserving The 2017 Republican Tax Cuts. “Miller-Meeks, an ophthalmologist, former director of the Iowa Department of Public Health and a retired lieutenant colonel in the U.S. Army, has said she will fight for skills training and apprenticeships to prepare Iowa's workforce for the 21st Century, fair trade deals that allow Iowans to compete
around the globe, and economic solutions that will strengthen the U.S. economy and increase Iowan's take-home pay, including preserving the 2017 Republican tax cuts.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 11/4/20]

### March 2021: Cedar Rapids Gazette Gave Tax March’s Claim That Miller-Meeks Supported Tax Breaks For Billionaires A “D” Grade Due To Her Not Being Seated In Congress For Votes On The Trump Tax Cuts

March 2021: Cedar Rapids Gazette Gave Tax March’s Claim That Miller-Meeks Supported Tax Breaks For Billionaires A “D” Grade Due To Her Not Being Seated In Congress For Votes On The Trump Tax Cuts. “Claim 2: ‘Even though there's only one billionaire in Iowa, Mariannette Miller-Meeks supports giving billionaires huge tax breaks for private jets and yachts.’ According to Forbes' interactive billionaire map, Iowa's only billionaire is Harry Stine, the founder of Stine Seeds. Stine lives in Adel, which is not part of Miller-Meeks' district. The ad cites a 2018 Business Insider article about former President Donald Trump's tax plan allowing private jet buyers to deduct 100 percent of the cost from their taxes. Miller-Meeks was not in Congress when the tax bill became law in 2017 and therefore did not vote on it and likely had no say on the private jet and yacht tax breaks. Nikki Haley, the former U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, said Oct. 21 while campaigning with Miller Meeks that the Ottumwa Republican would work to preserve the Trump tax cuts, according to a Quad-City Times article. Trump's tax reform law had many components to it, so that doesn't necessarily mean she supports 'huge tax breaks' for private jets and yachts. We give this claim a D.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, 3/1/21]

### February 2021: Tax March Called Out Miller-Meeks For Her Opposition To Biden’s COVID-19 Relief Package While Still Supporting Trump Tax Cuts For Billionaires And Corporations

February 2021: Tax March Called Out Miller-Meeks For Her Opposition To Biden’s COVID-19 Relief Package While Still Supporting Trump Tax Cuts For Billionaires And Corporations. “A new ad campaign led by the progressive group Tax March calls out Iowa U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, R-Iowa, for her opposition to President Joe Biden’s $1.9 trillion COVID relief package. Miller-Meeks last week voted against a budget resolution that could clear the way for Biden’s coronavirus relief package. Miller-Meeks, in a statement following her vote, criticized Democrats for pushing forward ‘partisan issues such as a national $15/hour minimum wage, which would kill thousands of jobs across the country and in southeastern Iowa, and bailouts for state governments, such as Illinois, who have mismanaged their budgets,’ rather than working in a bipartisan manner to address the pandemic and ‘deliver real, targeted relief for our constituents.’ The new ad, which will air in southeast Iowa's 2nd Congressional District, is part of a multistate campaign aimed at pressuring members of Congress to back Biden's plan. The #ReliefNOW campaign calls for 'full, fast and fair relief’ to help struggling Iowans pay rent and medical and utility bills, and feed their families. Tax March, in a news release, argues Miller-Meeks 'is leaving Iowa families who need massive economic relief high and dry,” while standing firm in her commitment to protecting the Trump tax cuts for billionaires and corporations.” [Quad-City Times, 2/10/21]

### Bush Tax Cuts

#### 2015: Miller-Meeks Shared A Tweet That Said “& For Billionth Time It Wasn't W's Tax Cuts That Led To The Recession But Absurd Policies On Affordable Housing”

2015: Miller-Meeks Shared A Tweet That Said “& For Billionth Time It Wasn't W's Tax Cuts That Led To The Recession But Absurd Policies On Affordable Housing.” “Yes MT RT @DavidLimbaugh : & for billionth time it wasn't W's tax cuts that led to the recession but absurd policies on affordable housing” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 2/9/15]

#### 2010: Miller-Meeks Said She Supported Extending The Bush Tax Cuts

Miller-Meeks Supported Extending The Bush Tax Cuts. “Miller-Meeks called the allegation that she would raise taxes ‘slightly ludicrous,’ saying she didn’t know any Republican who would run on that platform. Instead, Miller-Meeks said that instituting a fair tax would make the process simpler, eliminate loopholes and increase compliance. She said there needs to be a comprehensive discussion about tax policy, and that it was irresponsible
for Congress to wait until the last minute to decide whether to extend the Bush tax credits when they had known for four years they would expire at the end of 2010. She accused Loebsack of switching his position to one that was more favorable during this election cycle. Congress adjourned before voting on the tax cuts.” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 10/13/10]

**Corporate Tax**

**June 2021: Miller-Meeks Said She Did Not Want To Raise Taxes On Corporations Because “Taxes On Investment Hurts All Of Us”**

June 2021: Miller-Meeks Said She Did Not Want To Raise Taxes On Corporations Because “Taxes On Investment Hurts All Of Us.” NIEDLEMAN: “You just mentioned how Republicans are drawing that line in the sand that an infrastructure deal can't raise taxes, specifically on corporations, and that would force the president's two trillion dollar-plus proposal to be cut, essentially, in about half. But yet, the Institute on Taxation and Economic Policy found 55 of the largest corporations paid no taxes for their most recent fiscal year, and they put a price on that tax avoidance at $12 billion. So, why aren't Republicans trying to force corporations to pay income taxes and perhaps pay for that infrastructure? Are you okay with that?” MILLER-MEEKS: “Well, I think you can certainly look at the tax code and the tax structure to determine you know, how you pay taxes, what gets paid in taxes, and then we have to be very mindful that taxes on investment hurts all of us because that money gets invested into companies, to businesses, to venture capital, to entrepreneurs, which helps create jobs and grow our economy. So, you know, we know that there are taxes that are harmful and don't help grow an economy, that don't create jobs. And then we know that there is a taxation level at which most of us agree is fair.” [YouTube, Local 4 News WHBF, 6/20/21] (VIDEO)

**June 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted For An Amendment That Requires Companies To Disclose What They Would Pay If Corporate Taxes Increase**

June 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted For An Amendment That Requires Companies To Disclose What They Would Pay If Corporate Taxes Increase. In June 2021, Miller-Meeks voted for: “Burgess, R-Texas, amendment no. 1 that would require publicly traded companies, if the federal corporate tax rate increases, to disclose what payments they would have made if the rate remained the same as it was on June 1, 2021.” The amendment was rejected 204 to 218. [H R 1187, Vote #164, 6/16/21; CQ, 6/16/21]

**2014: Miller-Meeks Said She Favored Cuts To Corporate Income Taxes**

2014: Miller-Meeks Said She Favored Cuts To Corporate Income Taxes. “Miller-Meeks resigned from her position as director of the public health agency to again try to unseat four-term Democratic Rep. Dave Loebsack. While campaigning, she has stressed her military career and experience in health care. She said both have given her a unique position to understand issues such as the treatment of service men and women at Veterans Affairs hospitals. She favors cuts to corporate income taxes and a reduction in regulations.” [Telegraph Herald, 6/4/14]

**2013: Miller-Meeks Tweeted “We Should Go ‘Canada’ In Past Decade: Lowered Ind & Corporate Taxes, Trade Agreements & Domestic Energy Prod”**

2013: Miller-Meeks Tweeted “We Should Go ‘Canada’ In Past Decade: Lowered Ind & Corporate Taxes, Trade Agreements & Domestic Energy Prod.” “@NPR_Not_Neutral @pdcanada1 We should go ‘Canada’ in past decade: lowered ind & corporate taxes, trade agreements & domestic energy prod” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 2/23/13]
2010: Miller-Meeks Said She Supported “Reducing The Second Highest-In-The-World Corporate Income Tax Rate.” According to Miller-Meeks for Congress 2010 website Miller-Meeks wrote “Support reducing the second highest-in-the-world corporate income tax rate. Cutting the tax rate from 35% to 20% will unleash a tidal wave of new economic activity, resulting in millions of new good paying jobs and fantastic technological innovations that put us on a strong path to a brighter economic future.” [Miller-Meeks for Congress 2010, accessed 6/15/20]

2008: Miller-Meeks Said Lowering The Corporate Tax To 20 Percent Would Help The Economy And The Lost Money Would Be Made Up From Increased Production

“Another economic issue is the corporate tax. The U.S. has the second highest rate in the world. Miller-Meeks said lowering that to 20 percent would help the economy. The lost money from lowering the tax would be made up through more production and more people working and paying taxes.” [Daily Democrat, 5/1/08]

Estate Tax & Stepped-Up Basis


Miller-Meeks Op-Ed: Repealing Stepped-Up Basis Would “Force Heirs To Sell All Or Parcels Of Farmland To Pay Large Taxes On Assets That They Simply Cannot Afford To Pay Off.” “Recently, there was movement in Congress to eliminate the stepped-up basis at death on capital gains. Stepped-up basis is the modification of the value of an appreciated asset for tax reasons once inherited. In plain English, a stepped-up basis adjusts the value of an asset when it passes from an owner to their heir. […] Many farmers have most of their assets tied up in the family farm because the costs associated with running a farming operation are so high. Eliminating the step-up in basis would force heirs to sell all or parcels of farmland to pay large taxes on assets that they simply cannot afford to pay off when a transfer through inheritance occurs.” [Iowa Torch, Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 9/21/21]

August 2021: Miller-Meeks Tweeted “The Death Tax Has Hurt Family Farms Across Iowa For Years And Doubling Down On This Will Hurt Them Even More”

August 2021: Miller-Meeks Tweeted “The Death Tax Has Hurt Family Farms Across Iowa For Years And Doubling Down On This Will Hurt Them Even More.” “Well said by @SenJohnThune in @FoxNews . The death tax has hurt family farms across Iowa for years and doubling down on this will hurt them even more. #IA02 #IowaAg” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 8/11/21]

2012: Miller-Meeks Said She Liked The Idea Of Abolishing The Estate Tax

2012: Miller-Meeks Said She Liked The Idea Of Abolishing The Estate Tax. “Like this idea! RT @coryjcrowley : Newt: abolish death tax because it is immoral. #iacaucus #bold ideas” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 1/2/12]

Gas Tax
September 2020: Miller-Meeks Said An Increase In The Federal Gas Tax Was An Option For Funding Infrastructure Projects. “Miller-Meeks said the infrastructure needs are clear, but the source of cash to pay for the work is less so. ‘The question is, how do we pay for that? We know that with electric vehicles and hybrid vehicles, our road-use tax revenues have decreased,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘Our state in fact increased its fuel tax several years ago to try to adjust and adapt for that. I would be glad to pay a higher registration fee for my hybrid vehicle to help pay’ for infrastructure projects, she added. Governments have struggled as Americans drive less, or drive more-efficient vehicles. That means they buy less fuel, and pay less taxes that traditionally have paid for road work. ‘I think we all know that our bridges, our locks on the Mississippi River, our dams, our highways’ need work, Miller-Meeks said. ‘Some of our roads in Ottumwa are terrible.’ Congress needs to pass an infrastructure bill covering five to 10 years of projects, possibly paid for by an increase in the federal fuel tax, Miller-Meeks said. At the same time, the federal government should back research into how to make roads last longer, she added.” [Iowa Capital Dispatch, 9/10/20]

General Statements On Taxation

April 2021: Miller-Meeks Said “I Am Discouraged Over The President’s Plan To Raise Taxes, Which I Believe Will Inevitably Harm Hard-Working Taxpayers”

April 2021: Following A Presidential Address, Miller-Meeks Said “I Am Discouraged Over The President’s Plan To Raise Taxes, Which I Believe Will Inevitably Harm Hard-Working Taxpayers.” “The President was well-received by Members of Congress, and his speech was well-toned and well-delivered. He spoke on unity, bipartisanship, and coming together as a nation. Unfortunately, I do not believe we have seen much of this in the first 100 days of his Administration. I am discouraged over the President’s plan to raise taxes, which I believe will inevitably harm hard-working taxpayers.” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 4/29/21]

October 2014: Miller-Meeks Said “We Need To Hold The Line On Taxes So Our Middle Class Isn’t Paying More And Getting Less”

October 2014: Miller-Meeks Said “We Need To Hold The Line On Taxes So Our Middle Class Isn’t Paying More And Getting Less.” “Each candidate continues to spread their message. According to Miller-Meeks, she wants to be able to get more money to the middle class in Iowa. ‘Iowa’s middle class is being squeezed because of rising food and gas prices, growing health care costs, and shrinking wages,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘We need policies that grow wages to give our middle class families the peace of mind they deserve. We need to hold the line on taxes so our middle class isn’t paying more and getting less.’” [Daily Democrat, 10/31/14]

2015: Miller-Meeks Tweeted “TAX DAY- At Least When I Was Campaigning, Had No Income, Paid Less Tax To Irresponsible, (? Well Intentioned) Bloated Government”

2015: Miller-Meeks Tweeted “TAX DAY- At Least When I Was Campaigning, Had No Income, Paid Less Tax To Irresponsible, (? Well Intentioned) Bloated Government.” “TAX DAY- at least when I was campaigning, had no income, paid less tax to irresponsible, (? well intentioned) bloated government” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 4/15/15]


I'm inside preparing taxes. How long do you work for government before what you earn is truly yours?” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 3/21/15]

**Inflation**

**November 2021: Miller-Meeks Said Inflation Was The “Most Insidious And Regressive Of Taxes And Breaks POTUS Promise Not To Raise Taxes On Anyone Making <$400,000”**

November 2021: Miller-Meeks said inflation was the “most insidious and regressive of taxes and breaks POTUS promise not to raise taxes on anyone making <$400,000. Massive govt spending -> inflation…” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 11/23/21]


July 2021: Miller-Meeks: “Inflation is an insidious tax, and a regressive tax, that disproportionately affects people of color, low-income individuals, working families, and seniors on a fixed income.” [CQ, 7/27/21]

**IRS**

**October 2021: Miller-Meeks Joined Two Bills And A Letter To Biden Opposing Expansion Of Data Collection Or Required Reporting By The IRS**

October 2021: Miller-Meeks joined two bills and a letter to Biden opposing expansion of data collection or required reporting by the IRS. “Today, October 21st, 2021, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02) joined over 200 of her colleagues in a letter, led by Rep. Tom Emmer (MN-06), to the Secretary of the United States Department of Treasury, Janet Yellen, reiterating their concerns with the Biden Administration’s proposal to expand the data collected by the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) on Americans’ bank accounts. ‘The Administration’s continued push to invade Americans’ privacy should concern everyone. Raising the reporting threshold from $600 to $10,000 still means the overwhelming majority of Americans will be targeted by the IRS,’ said Miller-Meeks. ‘The Treasury Department’s response to our September 13 letter was unacceptable and I am proud to join this second letter to show the Administration that we will not back down. I will continue to fight to ensure that all Americans’ right to privacy is protected.’” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 10/21/21]

- **Miller-Meeks Signed A Letter Condemning Both The Proposed $600 And $10,000 IRS Reporting Thresholds For Bank Accounts To Combat Tax Evasion.** “Democrats proposed a new policy to allow the Internal Revenue Service to monitor certain bank transactions for money that does not come from a taxable payroll or from federal benefits. The intent, according to the Biden administration, was to better track which businesses and individuals were reporting less taxable income than they actually made. […] In the House, Miller-Meeks and Rep. Ashley Hinson co-sponsored a similar bill against reporting bank information to the IRS. Rep. Randy Feenstra was not listed as a co-sponsor on Friday, but he did sign onto a letter from House Republicans to Treasury Secretary Janet Yellen. The letter condemned both the $600 and $10,000 thresholds. ‘Your proposal … will likely sow further distrust in our financial system due to the ongoing and valid concerns
about the IRS’s ability to protect the privacy and financial data of the American people and potentially enlarge the unbanked population,’ the letter reads. Miller-Meeks and Hinson also signed the letter.” [Iowa Capital Dispatch, 10/22/21]

October 2021: Miller-Meeks Joined Bills Preventing The IRS From Monitoring Large Transactions And From Implementing Any New Reporting Requirements For Banks. “Today, October 15th, 2021, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02) joined two pieces of legislation that would prevent the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) from invading Americans’ privacy. The Protecting Financial Privacy Act, introduced by Rep. Ashley Hinson (IA-01) and Sen. Tommy Tuberville (R-AL), and would prevent the IRS from monitoring Americans' financial transactions by blocking the provision in the reconciliation package that would allow the IRS to monitor transactions of $600 or more. The Prohibiting IRS Financial Surveillance Act was introduced by Rep. Drew Ferguson (GA-03) and would ban the IRS from implementing any new reporting requirements for banks or other financial institutions. ‘This new IRS surveillance program is an invasion of privacy and unacceptable. This overreach by the majority would infringe upon the rights of Iowans and average Americans,’ said Miller-Meeks. ‘I am proud to co-sponsor two pieces of legislation to address this issue and I thank my colleagues for their work to protect our constituents’ financial privacy from even more government surveillance.’” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 10/15/21]

March 2021: Miller-Meeks Joined A Letter Requesting Additional Staffing For The Iowa Taxpayer Advocate Service Office, Which Assisted Iowans With Questions About The IRS

March 2021: Miller-Meeks Joined A Letter Requesting Additional Staffing For The Iowa Taxpayer Advocate Service Office, Which Assisted Iowans With Questions About The IRS. “Today, March 4th, 2021, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02) joined Sens. Chuck Grassley (R-IA) and Joni Ernst (R-IA) and Reps. Cindy Axne (IA-03), Randy Feenstra (IA-04), and Ashley Hinson (IA-01) in a letter requesting additional staffing for the Iowa Taxpayer Advocate Service (TAS) office. In a letter to the head of the National Taxpayer Advocate office, the members highlight concerns that the Iowa TAS office does not have enough staff to assist Iowans with questions and concerns regarding the Internal Revenue Service (IRS). ‘Due to the disruptions and complicated situations faced by Iowans during the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, all of our offices are anticipating a significant increase in constituent requests for assistance with resolving tax issues,’ the members wrote, ‘Our constituents are already dealing with new unfamiliar situations like unemployment and the Recovery Rebate Credit with reduced ability to get in-person help… the ability of our offices to resolve these concerns quickly and effectively depends on an efficient Iowa TAS office, which is under-resourced at a critical time.’ Iowa’s only Local Taxpayer Advocate office, located in Des Moines, serves the entire state to resolve problems with the IRS, including lack of communication from the IRS or financial difficulties.” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 3/4/21]

2014: Miller-Meeks Claimed The IRS Was Targeting Conservative Non-Profits

Miller-Meeks Claimed The IRS Was Targeting Conservative Non-Profits. “Miller-Meeks said she was amazed by the ‘Main Stream Press’ and how for at least the past five years they have failed to call the Obama administration to task for a long list of alleged transgressions. She pointed to Fast and Furious allegedly backed by the U.S. Justice Department dealing with gun running, IRS targeting of conservative non-profits, NSA collecting data on Americans after saying they were not, the FCC idea to monitor all American newsrooms and Benghazi, where Americans died.” [Ad Express & Daily Iowegian, 4/18/14]

2013: Miller-Meeks Tweeted “How Can The IRS Issue $4 Billion In Fraud Tax Refunds??? To Lithuania, Bulgaria, Ireland Or Shanghai? Duh? And They're Gonna Run HC?”

2013: Miller-Meeks Tweeted “How Can The IRS Issue $4 Billion In Fraud Tax Refunds??? To Lithuania, Bulgaria, Ireland Or Shanghai? Duh? And They're Gonna Run HC?” “How can the IRS issue $4 billion in fraud tax refunds??? To Lithuania, Bulgaria, Ireland or Shanghai? Duh? And they're gonna run HC?” [Twitter,
Tax Credits

2010: Miller-Meeks Said She Supported R&D Tax Credits


Payroll Taxes

2010: Miller-Meeks Said She Would “Support A Payroll Tax Holiday Which Would Provide An Immediate And Direct Increase To Worker's Paychecks”

2010: Miller-Meeks Said She Would “Support A Payroll Tax Holiday Which Would Provide An Immediate And Direct Increase To Worker's Paychecks.” According to Miller-Meeks for Congress 2010 website Miller-Meeks wrote “To get our economy moving again, I will: Support a payroll tax holiday which would provide an immediate and direct increase to worker’s paychecks and will boost our local economy by stimulating demand.” [Miller-Meeks for Congress 2010, accessed 6/15/20]

Flat Tax/“Fair Tax”

2010: Miller-Meeks Supported A ‘Fair Tax’ That Would Raise Taxes On The Middle Class While Cutting Them For The Wealthy

2010 Ottumwa Courier Editorial: Miller-Meeks “Voiced Support For The ‘Fair Tax’ That Even Her Own Party’s Experts Acknowledge Would Be Anything But Fair To Middle Class Americans” “This year’s political partisanship has ratcheted up the campaign vehemence with terms such as ‘fired’ and ‘eliminated’ when the subject is incumbents, and Miller-Meeks has shed her moderate views to match the times. She has made much of her refusal to buy medical insurance. She has voiced support for the ‘fair tax’ that even her own party’s experts acknowledge would be anything but fair to middle class Americans. But in all that politicking one thing stands out in her campaign. Back in the earliest days of this race, she said if she lost this time she’d move to the East Coast.” [The Ottumwa Courier, Editorial Board, 10/21/10]

“Fair Tax” Would Raise Taxes On The Middle Class, While The Wealthiest Households Would See The Biggest Tax Reductions

The “Fair Tax” Would Raise Taxes On The Middle Class, While The Wealthiest Households Would See The Biggest Tax Reductions. “Eliminating income taxes would, in most states, mean the wealthiest households would see the biggest tax reductions. The net result would be an overall tax increase for everyone else. ‘FairTax’ proposals would include a rebate to shield low-income taxpayers from this tax increase, but the rebate would not be large enough to shield middle-income families from bearing the brunt.” [Office on Budget and Policy Priorities, 9/7/10]

The “Fair Tax” Would Require Huge Local Sales Tax Hikes. “This examination reveals that, in every case, ‘FairTax’ proposals would: Require huge, and probably unworkable, sales tax rate hikes. ‘FairTax’ proposals would do away with revenue sources that now provide 42 percent of the average state’s tax revenue — funds that are essential for K-12 education, health care, public safety, social services, and other functions. To fully replace
revenue lost from eliminating other taxes, sales tax rates would have to be markedly higher than they are now, and often higher than ‘FairTax’ proponents claim would be needed.” [Office on Budget and Policy Priorities, 9/7/10]

Miller-Meeks Said She Wanted People To Have The Opportunity To Choose A “Flat Tax,” Which Would Be A Windfall For The Wealthy While Increasing Taxes On The Middle Class

Miller-Meeks Said She Wanted To Change The Income Tax System And Give People The Opportunity To Choose A Flat Tax. “Miller-Meeks […]would like to change the income tax system too. She would like people to have the opportunity to choose a flat tax. It would cut down on paperwork and headaches from the large, complex tax code Americans face.” [Daily Democrat, 5/1/08]

- **Flat Tax Would Eliminate Tax Brackets And Replace With A Single Rate, Most Likely Remove Deductions & Credits From Current Code Including Home Mortgage Interest Deduction.** “The basic notion behind a flat tax is to eliminate the current system of six tax brackets—in which people with higher incomes pay higher tax rates—with a single uniform rate. Most flat tax proposals also eliminate most or all of the deductions and credits in the current code—such as the mortgage interest deduction, the deduction for charitable giving, and hundreds of lesser-used preferences.” [EPI: Cutting Taxes for the Rich Never Ends Well, 11/02/11]

Flat Tax Would Be A Windfall For The Wealthy, While Increasing Taxes On The Middle Class

Flat Tax Would Increase Taxes On The Middle Class While Reducing Them For The Wealthy. “The regressivity of the flat tax is another big problem. Our current federal income tax code is progressive (rates rise with income), and every distributional analysis I’ve ever seen of a flat tax shows a transfer of the tax burden from the wealthy to the middle class. According to the Tax Policy Center’s score of the Perry tax plan, the tax bill of families with incomes between $30,000 and 40,000 would go up by about $450, while that of millionaires would fall by about half a million bucks.” [Washington Post, 5/26/15]

**Citizens For Tax Justice: Flat Tax Means That The Rich “Will Pay Far, Far Less In Taxes.”** According to a report from Citizens for Tax Justice: “The first part of that claim is largely true. Since Armey’s plan does not tax income from interest, dividends, or capital gains, those taxpayers who live completely off of investment income would be taken off the rolls entirely. The second part of the claim is, by any serious accounting, wrong. Armey’s plan has two parts: It replaces the progressive income tax with a flat tax, and it replaces business taxes with a consumption tax. Both elements would dramatically shift the tax burden from the wealthy toward the middle class and the poor. If not for stunning misrepresentations, this would be obvious to everyone. Our personal income tax now starts with a zero effective rate on lower-income families (families of four currently earning up to about $23,200 pay no income taxes) rising to a 39.6 percent top marginal rate on the incomes of the richest 1 percent. Replace that with a flat rate of, say, 20 percent and clearly the rich will pay far, far less in taxes. That has to be made up somewhere.” [Citizens for Tax Justice, accessed 5/12/16]

Under A Flat Tax Plan, “The More You Make, The Bigger Your Tax Break.” In June 2015, CNN reported: “The short answer is probably yes. But a lot depends on how much money you make — the more you make, the bigger your tax break. The plan that Paul described in a Wall Street Journal column Thursday would tax everyone – businesses and and individuals – at a flat 14.5% rate.” [CNN, 6/18/15]

**EPI: Flat Tax Would Benefit High-Income Earners; “Top 1 Percent Would See An Average Tax Cut Of Over $200,000.”** “The flat tax is certainly a good deal for high-income individuals. Although they might not get to deduct mortgage interest payments on their vacation homes, those with high incomes more than make up for it in the lower, ‘flatter’ rate. For example, under a 20 percent flat tax (similar to the one proposed by Perry), the top 1 percent would see an average tax cut of over $200,000.” [EPI: Cutting Taxes for the Rich Never Ends Well, 11/02/11]
Proposed 15 Percent Flat Tax Would Raise Taxes On Teacher Making $20K A Year By Nearly $500, Slash Taxes On Attorney Earning $500K A Year By More Than Half. “The fallacy of the claim that a flat tax promotes fairness is easily illustrated by a hypothetical in which the current progressive tax system, using the 2014 tax brackets, is replaced by a flat tax with a rate of 15 percent. A teacher with $20,000 of taxable income filing as single would have paid $2,550 under the current tax code compared to $3,000 under a 15 percent flat tax. Meanwhile, a lawyer with a taxable income of $500,000 would have paid $155,046 under the current system but only $75,000 under a 15 percent flat tax. Since the current tax system has a progressive rate structure—meaning that higher incomes are subject to higher tax rates—those at the top will always benefit the most from a flat tax, regardless of the level at which the single tax rate is set.” [Center for American Progress Debunking 7 Persistent Tax Reform Myths, 10/22/15]

Potential 15 Percent Flat Tax Would Mean “Taxes On The Bottom Fifth Would Increase More Than Sevenfold, While The Top 1 Percent Would See Their Taxes Cut Almost In Half.” “A 2011 Congressional Budget Office study, for example, found that American households in the lowest fifth of the income ladder paid about 2 percent of their income in federal taxes. The top fifth paid 21 percent of their total income and the top 1 percent paid 29 percent. So if a flat tax hit all households with, say, a 15 percent rate that would mean taxes on the bottom fifth would increase more than sevenfold, while the top 1 percent would see their taxes cut almost in half.” [CNBC, 11/12/15]
**Trade & Outsourcing Issues**

### Significant Findings

- **2020**: Miller-Meeks said that she would have voted to pass the USMCA if she had been in Congress.
  - Miller-Meeks called passage of the USMCA “critically important,” and said it would benefit Iowa farmers, producers, and workers.

- **2021**: Miller-Meeks said she would work to bring manufacturing of Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) and pharmaceuticals back to the United States from China.

- **2019**: Miller-Meeks said she and “most people” appreciated that Trump was “willing to take on China” and tried to negotiate a trade deal.

- **2021**: Miller-Meeks co-sponsored a bill granting permanent residency to college graduates who entered the United States as children of documented foreign visa workers.
  - Breitbart: Miller-Meeks’ bill would extend the “outsourcing process” to “shift heartland wealth to coastal states and also pump foreign visa-workers into the leftover heartland state jobs.”

- **2021**: Miller-Meeks sponsored a bill authorizing USCIS to award unused employment visas from FY2020 and FY2021 to eligible applicants after September 30, 2021.

---

**USMCA**

**2020: Miller-Meeks: “Iowa Farmers, Ag Producers And Workers Are Going To Benefit From USMCA.”**

According to Mariannette Miller-Meeks Twitter, Miller-Meeks said “Iowa farmers, ag producers and workers are going to benefit from USMCA. We need to continue to make our trade deals fair and sell more Iowa products. #ia02.” [Dr. Miller-Meeks Twitter, 1/1/20]

---

**Gov. Kim Reynolds**: #USMCA is a historic agreement for Iowa families, farmers and small business owners. Grateful to @POTUS and his administration for their unwavering commitment to getting this agreement done.

[Twitter, @iagovernor, 1/1/20]

Miller-Meeks: “It’s Critically Important That The US House Pass USMCA.” “I think it’s critically important that the US House pass USMCA, or the United States Mexico Canada Trade Agreement. This is something that’s already been passed both by Canada and Mexico, and is only waiting for the House of Representatives to pass.” [YouTube, Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 11/14/19] (VIDEO) 00:01:50

2019: Miller-Meeks Said “If I Was In Congress Right Now, I Would Immediately Pass This Trade Deal And Put It On President Donald Trump’s Desk”

Miller-Meeks: “PASS THE USMCA: If I Was In Congress Right Now, I Would Immediately Pass This Trade Deal And Put It On President Donald Trump’s Desk.”

2019: Miller-Meeks Said She Would Never Quit Fighting For The Passage Of The USMCA

Miller-Meeks Said She Would Never Quit Fighting For The Passage Of The USMCA. “Iowa Secretary of Agriculture Mike Naig announced Thursday that he is supporting Miller-Meeks in her campaign for the Republican nomination in the race for Iowa’s 2nd Congressional District. […] Miller-Meeks responded with thanks to the endorsement saying in the statement, ‘I will never quit fighting for Iowa’s biofuels industry, for fair trade deals, for the passage of the USMCA, and for strong policies that support our farmers and producers.’” [Iowa City Press-Citizen, 12/5/19]


2013: Miller-Meeks Tweeted “We Should Go ‘Canada’ In Past Decade: Lowered Ind[idual] & Corporate Taxes, Trade Agreements & Domestic Energy Prod.” “@NPR_Not_Neutral @pdcanada1 We should go ‘Canada’ in past decade: lowered ind & corporate taxes, trade agreements & domestic energy prod” [Twitter, @millermeeks, 2/23/13]
2021: Miller-Meeks Said She Would Work To Bring Manufacturing Of Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) And Pharmaceuticals Back To The United States From China

January 2021: Upon Her Swearing In, Miller-Meeks Cited Pandemic Preparedness, Infrastructure, And Bringing Manufacturing, Especially That Of PPE And Pharmaceuticals, “Back From China” As Her Priorities. “Miller-Meeks said she is hopeful the diverse class of female freshmen will lend itself to more bipartisanship in a divided Congress, with narrow margins in both the House and Senate. ‘I think there are avenues and things that we can agree on, and I think there is an appetite to work together and accomplish that,’ Miller-Meeks said. ‘I think you especially see that in the women legislators, but in all legislators. ... I do think we can accomplish things and we can, you know, move things in a bipartisan fashion.’ She said that includes ‘getting through pandemic and preparing for the next pandemic’; ‘bringing manufacturing back from China’ to address limited domestic stockpiles in medical supplies — including personal protective equipment (PPE) and pharmaceuticals — as the nation grapples with containing COVID-19; and pushing forward a long-stalled infrastructure spending bill to upgrade the nation's roads, bridges, locks and dams, and expand high-speed broadband internet service to rural and urban areas.” [Quad-City Times, 1/3/21]

November 2020: Miller-Meeks Said She Would Work To Bring Manufacturing Back From China To Increase Domestic PPE And Pharmaceutical Production. “Miller-Meeks also fielded questions about the pandemic, stating her first priority if elected to Congress will be to address COVID-19. That includes working to bring manufacturing back from China to increase domestic production of personal protective equipment and pharmaceuticals, and beefing up and adding reagents and testing supplies to the national repository of antibiotics, vaccines, ventilators and other critical medical supplies.” [Quad-City Times, 11/3/20]

2021: Miller-Meeks Served On The House Committee Overseeing The National Strategic Stockpile

Daily Nonpareil: Miller-Meeks Joined The House Committee Overseeing The National Strategic Stockpile She Had Vowed To Use To Bring Medical Manufacturing Back To The United States From China. “Miller-Meeks, a physician, was assigned a seat this week on the House Homeland Security Committee, along with Veterans’ Affairs and Education and Labor committees. [...] The Homeland Security Committee has legislative jurisdiction over the National Strategic Stockpile. While campaigning this past fall, Miller-Meeks frequently highlighted the stockpile’s value in preparing the country for future pandemics, vowing to draw on her military and public health experience to revamp it and bring manufacturing back from China to address limited domestic medical supplies — including personal protective equipment and pharmaceuticals. In an August column, Miller-Meeks advocated that Congress quickly consider adopting new rules for federal PPE purchases that restricts the U.S. Department of Defense from purchasing certain products from foreign sources to create ‘a stable demand for U.S.-made PPE that will incentivize investment in domestic PPE manufacturing.’” [Daily Nonpareil, 1/27/21]

2019: Miller-Meeks Said She And “Most People” Appreciated That Trump Was “Willing To Take On China” And Tried To Negotiate A Trade Deal

Miller-Meeks Said She And “Most People” Appreciated That Trump Was “Willing To Take On China” And Tried To Negotiate A Trade Deal. “I think most people do appreciate that President Trump is willing to take on China, try to renegotiate or to negotiate a trade deal with China, which is fair to the United States, which allows us to export products to China, but also import products to China, and also addresses the theft of intellectual property or property rights.” [YouTube, Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 11/14/19] (VIDEO) 00:01:25


Act, are we doing enough to pressure on China on their human rights abuses?”, Miller-Meeks said, “what is happening with the Uighurs, the indoctrination camps, reeducation camps is a travesty. we have freedom of religion in the United States that’s why people want to immigrate here. I think that we have, as we go through trade negotiations with China, we lose sight of other aspects of the United States, things that we stand for such as democracy, freedom of religion, freedom of speech. I think this is the right move by congress and the right move by the president. We should be standing by people who want freedom of expression, the freedom of opportunity that we have here in the United States.. That doesn’t mean we have to police every country. But I think we stand for human rights, we stand for freedom loving people in Hong Kong, so this was the right move to make.” [Caffeinated Thoughts, 00:10:22, 12/3/19] (AUDIO)

February 2020: Miller-Meek Was Irritated About The Delay In Passing USMCA Which Caused “Delays In Passing The Phase 1 China Deal” That Hurt The Farming Economy

February 2020: Miller-Meek Was Irritated About The Delay In Passing USMCA Which Caused “Delays In Passing The Phase 1 China Deal” That Hurt The Farming Economy. At a Westside Conservatives Meeting, the question Miller-Meek was asked was “What’s your position on China?” Miller-Meeks responded “I believe that you’re correct that Ambassador Branstad is in fact helping through the negotiations with China. I think delay in passing USMCA also caused delays in passing the Phase 1 China deal. I mean, I think there was just tremendous pressure on the house to pass USMCA. And a lot of that we did and we created USMCA should have been passed. You know, I won’t say a year ago but certainly should have been passed nine months ago and did not and hurt our farming economy. Within our state, and I think that we’re going to rebound from that.” [Westside Conservatives Meeting, 00:14:06, 2/26/20] (VIDEO)

• Miller-Meeks Was Asked What Was Her Position On China, Referencing Former Gov. Branstad Was Ambassador Helping With Trade And The Coronavirus. At a Westside Conservatives Meeting, the question Miller-Meek was asked was “I’d like to understand your position on China. We’re seeing right obviously Iowa has a strong relationship with China. Obviously, our previous governors over there now more than likely helping our president in some of these trade war issues and others, hopefully, helping with his Coronavirus issue. But we need to understand what’s going on there and the impact in our society right? There are large issues picking up with data, right five key, those types of things. And there are communists or socialists, we say that as well that didn’t work. We said keep it in the world when we say other countries didn’t work. We are hand in hand with China.” [Westside Conservatives Meeting, 00:22:35, 2/26/20] (VIDEO)

Miller-Meeks: “I Think It Was Very Important To Take On China. I May Not Have Done It In The Way That President Trump Did It… I’m A Free Market Person. So Tariffs Is Not Something That I’m Strongly In Favor Of”

Miller-Meeks: “I Think It Was Very Important To Take On China. I May Not Have Done It In The Way That President Trump Did it... I’m A Free Market Person. So Tariffs Is Not Something That I’m Strongly In Favor Of.” At a Westside Conservatives Meeting, the question Miller-Meek was asked was “What’s your position on China?” Miller-Meeks responded “So I think it was very important to take on China. I may not have done it in the way that President Trump did it. I’m not – I’m a free market person. So tariffs is not something that I’m strongly in favor of, but perhaps I was wrong. And perhaps in this case, it worked. Because now we have USMCA, we have the Japan deal, and we finally have China on the phase one trade deal. I think trade is important. trade has to be fair, it should be free. And I think trade is important, not only for the transfer of goods and the elevation and creation of wealth throughout the world, but also because it’s hard to go to war with your trading partners. So I do think it’s one of those things that helps to keep us a more peaceful world.” [Westside Conservatives Meeting, 00:26:32, 2/26/20] (VIDEO)

• Miller-Meeks Was Asked What Was Her Position On China, Referencing Former Gov. Branstad Was Ambassador Helping With Trade And The Coronavirus.” At a Westside Conservatives Meeting, the question Miller-Meek was asked was “I’d like to understand your position on China. We’re seeing right
obviously Iowa has a strong relationship with China. Obviously, our previous governors over there now more than likely helping our president in some of these trade war issues and others, hopefully, helping with his Coronavirus issue. But we need to understand what’s going on there and the impact in our society right? There are large issues picking up with data, right five key, those types of things. And there are communists or socialists, we say that as well that didn’t work. We said keep it in the world when we say other countries didn’t work. We are hand in hand with China.” [Westside Conservatives Meeting, 00:22:35, 2/26/20] (VIDEO)

Miller-Meeks Said She Has Known About China’s Intellectual Property Theft And Why Silicon Valley Companies Go To China Adding That They’re Going To Take Your Technology

Miller-Meeks Was Asked What Was Her Position On China, Referencing Former Gov. Branstad Was Ambassador Helping With Trade And The Coronavirus.” At a Westside Conservatives Meeting, the question Miller-Meek was asked was “I’d like to understand your position on China. We’re seeing right obviously Iowa has a strong relationship with China. Obviously, our previous governors over there now more than likely helping our president in some of these trade war issues and others, hopefully, helping with his Coronavirus issue. But we need to understand what’s going on there and the impact in our society right? There are large issues picking up with data, right five key, those types of things. And there are communists or socialists, we say that as well that didn’t work. We said keep it in the world when we say other countries didn’t work. We are hand in hand with China.” [Westside Conservatives Meeting, 00:22:35, 2/26/20] (VIDEO)

Outsourcing

2021: Miller-Meeks Co-Sponsored A Bill Granting Permanent Residency To College Graduates Who Entered The United States As Children Of Documented Foreign Visa Workers

July 2021: Miller-Meeks Co-Sponsored The America’s CHILDREN Act, A Bill Granting Permanent Residency To College Graduates Who Entered The United States As Children Of Legal Temporary Workers. On July 1, 2021, Miller-Meeks sponsored HR 4331, America's Cultivation of Hope and Inclusion for Long-term Dependents Raised and Educated Natively (America's CHILDREN) Act, which ‘provides lawful permanent resident status to certain college graduates who entered the United States as children and addresses other immigration-related issues. Specifically, this bill allows an alien to apply for lawful permanent resident status if the alien (1) was lawfully admitted into the United States as a dependent child of an alien on a temporary worker visa, (2) was in the United States with such status for at least four years, (3) has graduated from an institution of higher education in the United States, and (4) is not deportable or otherwise inadmissible. In addition, the alien must have been lawfully present in the United States for at least 10 years at the time of the application. The bill also modifies various provisions related to the calculation of an alien's age for immigration purposes and the priority date of certain immigration-related applications.” The bill was read twice and referred to House Judiciary. [HR 4331, Co-sponsored, 7/1/21; CQ, 7/1/21]

December 2021: Miller-Meeks Tweeted Her Support Of The Bill, Which She Said Would “Support Lifelong Americans.” “My America's CHILDREN Act would support lifelong Americans like @uiowa’s @PareenMhatre. They grew up here, went to college here, and positively contribute to our communities. I am proud to lead the effort to help these students. #YearInReview” [Twitter, @RepMMM, 12/30/21]
Breitbart: Miller-Meeks’ Bill Would Extend The “Outsourcing Process” To “Shift Heartland Wealth To Coastal States And Also Pump Foreign Visa-Workers Into The Leftover Heartland State Jobs”

U.S. Tech Workers’ Kevin Lynn: Miller-Meeks And Other Republicans Were “Toadies To The Corporations” For Pushing Legislation To Help Companies Hire Foreign Visa Workers. “Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (R-IA), Sen. Rand Paul (R-KY), and 12 other GOP legislators are pushing legislation to help Fortune 500 companies hire foreign visa workers instead of hiring the American graduates who might vote for the GOP. […] The bill — numbered H.4331 in the House and S. 2753 in the Senate — offers no compensatory gains for Americans, such as reforms to reduce the Fortune 500’s incentives to import foreign workers instead of hiring American graduates in states such as Iowa and Kentucky. ‘The antidote to a bad bill … is sunlight,’ said a statement from Kevin Lynn at U.S. Tech Workers. The main sponsors, Rep. Deborah Ross (D-NC) and Miller-Meeks, ‘need to be exposed for being toadies to the corporations and not sticking up for wage-earners,’ he added.” [Breitbart, 1/5/22]

Breitbart: Miller-Meeks’ Bill Would Extend The “Outsourcing Process” To “Shift Heartland Wealth To Coastal States And Also Pump Foreign Visa-Workers Into The Leftover Heartland State Jobs.” “This cheap, disposable, and compliant ‘green card workforce’ is excellent for investors — but it profoundly distorts the white-collar labor market and regional economies in the United States. […] The visa programs shift heartland wealth to coastal states and also pump foreign visa-workers into the leftover heartland state jobs. This process blocks many young Americans from starting professional careers. It sucks wealth and people from heartland states. It drains life from towns in Iowa, Kentucky, West Virginia, Michigan, Georgia, upstate New York, and many other places. The Miller-Meeks bill would extend this outsourcing process, even though there is no shortage of labor in a nation of 190 million working-age people and roughly 150 million jobs.” [Breitbart, 1/5/22]

October 2021: Miller-Meeks Sponsored A Bill Authorizing USCIS To Award Unused Employment Visas From FY2020 And FY2021 To Eligible Applicants After September 30, 2021

October 2021: Miller-Meeks Sponsored A Bill Authorizing USCIS To Award Unused Employment Visas From FY2020 And FY2021 To Eligible Applicants After September 30, 2021. On October 5, 2021, Miller-Meeks sponsored HR 5498, the Preserving Employment Visas Act, which would “authorize U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services to process employment-based immigrant visa applications after September 30, 2021, and to award such visas to eligible applicants from the pool of unused employment-based immigrant visas during fiscal years 2020 and 2021.” The bill was read twice and referred to House Judiciary. [HR 5498, Sponsored, 10/5/21; CQ, 10/5/21]

2014: Political Ad About Miller-Meeks Stated She Supported Tax Breaks For Corporations That Outsourced And Partnered With A Company That Outsourced Jobs To India; The Ad Was Said To Be Part True And Part Misleading

2014: Political Ad About Miller-Meeks Stated She Supported Tax Breaks For Outsourcing Corporations And That She Partnered With A Company That Outsourced Jobs To India While President Of An Organization. “The ad’s central claim is that Miller-Meeks supports ‘giving billions in special tax breaks to outsourcing corporations,’ and that as the president of an organization, she partnered with a company that outsourced jobs to India.” [WQAD-News 8, 10/19/14]


Miller-Meeks Backed Tax Breaks For Companies That Outsource Because She Opposed The 2010 House Bill, Which Limited A Range Of Complex Corporate Tax Provisions. “Let’s take the first claim first, that
Miller-Meeks backed tax breaks for companies that outsource. Loebsack and the DCCC say this claim stems from her opposition to a 2010 House bill — eventually a law — that provided $26.1 billion in aid to economically hurting states during the depths of the Great Recession. The House bill was partially paid for by limiting a range of complex corporate tax provisions. Democrats said the tax breaks helped companies that outsource jobs. Republicans argued the bill amounted to a tax increase on business. The savings from the tax changes amounted to $9.8 billion. It’s interesting to note the bigger savings in the bill was a $12 billion cut to the food stamp program.” [WQAD-News 8, 10/19/14]

The Ad Claimed Miller-Meeks Partnered With A Company That Outsourced Hundreds Of Good Paying Jobs To India But Was Said To Be Misleading.

The Ad Claimed Miller-Meeks Partnered With A Company That Outsourced Hundreds Of Good Paying Jobs To India But Was Said To Be Misleading. “Now, the second claim: The announcer in the ad says, ‘as the president of an organization, Miller-Meeks partnered with a company that outsourced hundreds of good paying jobs to India.’ At the same time, these words appear on the screen: ‘Mariannette Miller-Meeks company outsourced hundreds of jobs to India.’ This could mislead viewers into thinking that it was a Miller-Meeks company that was doing the outsourcing. That’s not the case.” [WQAD-News 8, 10/19/14]

The Claim Was Based On A 2007 Partnership Between The Iowa Medical Society And A Company Called Athenahealth Inc. “The basis for the claim, according to the DCCC and Loebsack, is a 2007 partnership between the Iowa Medical Society and a Watertown, Mass.-based company called athenahealth Inc., a service provider that assists medical offices with administrative tasks such as billing and collections.” [WQAD-News 8, 10/19/14]

Miller-Meeks Was President Of The Iowa Medical Society At The Time Of The Partnership. “Miller-Meeks was president of the medical society at the time, and a news release quoted her as saying the partnership would help physicians “run more efficient practices and better serve patients.”” [WQAD-News 8, 10/19/14]

As of 2013, The Company, Athenahealth, Had 3,000 Employees And 300 Were In India. “A 2005 Boston Globe article does say athenahealth employed 200 “low wage” data entry workers in India. But the India operations have been only a small part of the company's workforce, according to filings with the Securities and Exchange Commission. Its 2013 annual report says out of nearly 3,000 employees at the end of last year, about 300 were in Chennai, India. The rest were in the United States. At the end of 2007, the company had 26 workers in India out of a total of 610, with the rest in the U.S., according to its 10-K.” [WQAD-News 8, 10/19/14]

Ties To Foreign Policy

2019: Miller-Meeks Said Trade Contributed To World Peace, And Claimed That Countries Who Trade With Each Other Are Less Likely To Go To War

Miller-Meeks Said Trade Contributed To World Peace And Claimed That Countries Who Trade With Each Other Are Less Likely To Go To War. “I think free trade is important not only to our state but to our nation. […] Trade has even a more important benefit than just economics of our state, and that is in world peace. We know that those countries with whom we trade are also less likely to go to war with us.” [YouTube, Mariannette Miller-Meeks, 11/14/19] (VIDEO) 00:00:26-00:00:58
Veterans & Military Family Issues

**Significant Findings**

- January 2022: Miller-Meeks voted against expanding GI Bill benefits for National Guard and Reserve members.
  - A letter to the editor accused Miller-Meeks of hypocrisy in opposing the expansion given her own use of the GI Bill to obtain her education.

- August 2021: Miller-Meeks signed a letter to Defense Secretary Lloyd Austin opposing the military COVID-19 vaccine mandate, claiming it was illegal prior to complete approval of the vaccine.

- June 2021: Miller-Meeks joined a letter urging VA Secretary McDonough to prohibit the VA from providing abortion or abortion counseling.

- July 2021: Miller-Meeks joined a letter urging VA Secretary McDonough to reverse the decision for the VA to offer gender transition surgeries.

- January 2022: Miller-Meeks voted for an amendment that would replace most of the provisions in the Guard and Reserve GI Bill Parity Act and increase borrower fee rates for certain VA loans.

- September 2021: Miller-Meeks voted against an amendment that would strengthen servicemember consumer protections related to medical debt and credit reporting.

- Miller-Meeks on women being drafted into the military: “The goal of our military is not wokeness. The goal of our military is to protect the homeland.”

- 2009: Miller-Meeks said that if soldiers were not given a pay raise she would refuse any salary increase as a member of Congress.

- Miller-Meeks supported legislation to expand mental health care for veterans.

- Miller-Meeks co-sponsored the Vanessa Guillén Military Justice Improvement Act, which empowered independent, trained military prosecutors to handle serious military crimes.

**GI Bill Parity**

**Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Guard And Reserve GI Bill Parity Act**

**Jan. 2022: Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Guard And Reserve GI Bill Parity Act, Which Would Expand GI Bill Benefits For National Guard And Reserve Members.** In January 2022, Miller-Meeks voted against the “Passage of the bill that would expand GI Bill benefits for National Guard and Reserve members by including their training as eligible service with respect to educational assistance. It would specify that such benefits accrued through training before Aug. 1, 2025, would expire by Aug. 1, 2040, while benefits accrued through training after that date would not expire. As an offset, it would modify borrower fee rates for certain VA housing loans by delaying certain scheduled rate reductions for several months in 2031 and increasing rates for interest rate reduction refinancing loans closed from July 1, 2022, through Sept. 30, 2030. As amended, the bill would also require the Veterans Affairs Department to provide new veterans with information regarding medical care they are eligible for**
through VA benefits, including care provided through community providers, mental health care and military sexual trauma care.” Passed by a vote of 287-135. [HR 1836, Vote 6, 1/12/22; CQ, 1/12/22]

LTE: Miller-Meeks’ Vote Was Hypocritical Given Her Own Use Of The GI Bill

Letter To The Editor: While Miller-Meeks “Used The GI Bill For Her Own Education, Leveling The Playing Field Between National Guard/Reservists And Active-Duty Personnel Is Something She Can’t Abide.” “Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks should be consistent about where she stands on support for the military. On Jan. 12, she voted against expanding eligibility for educational benefits to our National Guard and Army Reserves in the Guard and Reserve GI Bill Parity Act of 2021 […] I’m weary of hearing her military resume because while she used the GI bill for her own education, leveling the playing field between National Guard/Reservists and active-duty personnel is something she can’t abide. I may have missed some fine print right wing politicians find objectionable, yet the big picture is Miller-Meeks voted against a bill to help men and women in uniform. Our military personnel deserve our thanks on behalf of a grateful nation. But no, Miller-Meeks couldn’t provide it.” [Daily Iowan, Paul Deaton LTE, 1/17/22]

Vaccine Mandate

August 2021: Miller-Meeks Signed A Letter To Defense Secretary Lloyd Austin Opposing The Military’s COVID-19 Vaccine Mandate, Claiming It Was Illegal Prior To Complete Approval Of The Vaccine


Health Care For Veterans

June 2021: Miller-Meeks Joined A Letter Urging VA Secretary McDonough To Prohibit The VA From Providing Abortion Or Abortion Counseling

June 2021: Miller-Meeks Joined A Letter Urging VA Secretary McDonough To Prohibit The VA From Providing Abortion Or Abortion Counseling. “Today, Rep. Mike Bost (R-Ill.), the Ranking Member of the House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, Rep. Matt Rosendale (R-Mont.), the Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Technology Modernization, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meek (R-Iowa), Rep. Chris Smith (R-NJ), and more than 130 Members of Congress, sent a letter to VA Secretary Denis McDonough, urging the Secretary to maintain the current laws which prohibit the Department of Veterans Affairs from offering abortions or providing abortion counsel. ‘The VA must never use taxpayer dollars to provide abortions or abortion counseling to veterans,’ the Members wrote. ‘To do so would be contrary to the God-given right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness that generations of veterans fought to defend.’” [House Committee On Veteran’s Affairs Republicans, Press Release, 6/16/21]
• **The Letter Claimed Providing Abortion Services “Would Be Contrary To The God-Given Right To Life, Liberty, And The Pursuit Of Happiness That Generations Of Veterans Fought To Defend.”** “Today, Rep. Mike Bost (R-III.), the Ranking Member of the House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, Rep. Matt Rosendale (R-Mont.), the Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Technology Modernization, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meek (R-Iowa), Rep. Chris Smith (R-NJ), and more than 130 Members of Congress, sent a letter to VA Secretary Denis McDonough, urging the Secretary to maintain the current laws which prohibit the Department of Veterans Affairs from offering abortions or providing abortion counsel. ‘The VA must never use taxpayer dollars to provide abortions or abortion counseling to veterans,’ the Members wrote. ‘To do so would be contrary to the God-given right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness that generations of veterans fought to defend.’” [House Committee On Veteran’s Affairs Republicans, Press Release, 6/16/21]

**July 2021: Miller-Meeks Joined A Letter Urging Veterans Affairs Secretary McDonough To Reverse The Decision For VA To Offer Gender Transition Surgeries**

July 2021: Miller-Meeks Joined A Letter Urging Veterans Affairs Secretary McDonough To Reverse The Decision For VA To Offer Gender Transition Surgeries. “House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs (HVAC) Subcommittee on Health Ranking Member Jack Bergman, HVAC Ranking Member Mike Bost, and 40 Republican colleagues sent a letter to Veterans Affairs Secretary Denis R. McDonough, expressing grave concern with his intent to allow the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) to offer gender transition surgeries, while thousands of Veterans, including those suffering from toxic exposure, still are unable to receive the care and benefits they've earned. [...] Joining Rep. Bergman and Ranking Member Bost were Reps: Jim Banks, Greg Murphy, Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Madison Cawthorn, Chip Roy, Tracey Mann, Barry Moore, Troy Nehls, Matt Rosendale, Nancy Mace, Steve Scalise, Jeff Duncan, Lisa McClain, Vern Buchanan, Brian Mast, Michael Guest, Doug Lamborn, Ralph Norman, Vicky Hartzler, Tim Burchett, Debbie Lesko, Lauren Boebert, Neal Dunn, Gus Bilirakis, Brian Babin, Diana Harshbarger, Stephanie Bice, Doug LaMalfa, Andy Harris, Jason Smith, Ron Estes, Kevin Hern, Brad Wenstrup, Glenn Grothman, Tim Walberg, Bruce Westerman, Jodey Arrington, Michael Cloud, Ben Cline, and Steve Womack. The letter stated in part, ‘We write to express our grave concern about your intent to allow the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) to offer gender transition surgery to our nation’s veterans. We urge you in the strongest possible terms to reverse your decision.’” [Office Of Rep. Jack Bergman, Press Release, 7/15/21]

**Miller-Meeks Supported Legislation To Expand Mental Health Care For Veterans**

October 2021: Miller-Meeks Sponsored A Bill Requiring The Department Of Defense To Develop Each Military Department’s Suicide Prevention Efforts. On October 20, 2021, Miller-Meeks sponsored HR 5645, Save Our Servicemembers Act of 2021, which “requires the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness within the Department of Defense (DOD) to evaluate and standardize DOD's suicide prevention efforts. Specifically, the bill directs the Defense Suicide Prevention Office to collaborate with each military department to (1) develop and implement a process to ensure that individual nonclinical suicide prevention efforts are assessed for effectiveness, and (2) develop consistent suicide-related definitions for use throughout DOD. The bill also requires the use of such suicide-related definitions in any updated policies of DOD or each military department.” The bill was read twice and referred to House Armed Services. [HR 5645, Sponsored, 10/20/21; CQ, 10/20/21]

**Miller-Meeks Said It Did Not Appear That The VA Was Combining Substance Use Treatment And Inpatient Mental Health Treatment.** “MARIANNETTE MILLER-MEEKS: Thank you, Dr. Miller. The reason for my question was because the veterans that I encounter, and I'm a twenty-four-year military veteran, the withdrawal from Afghanistan has been extraordinarily problematic for them and has led to increased mental health issues. So, Dr. Matthews on our second panel, the Wounded Warrior Project, and Mr. Armendariz will testify about the availability of substance use treatment in conjunction with inpatient mental health treatment, and how it appears that the VA does not combine these treatments or have a comorbidity treatment plan.” [CQ, 9/22/21]
Miller-Meeks Cosponsored A Bill To Improve The Veteran Crisis Line. “Miller-Meeks also co-sponsored a bipartisan and bicameral piece of legislation to improve the Veteran Crisis Line. She said her staff is working on developing legislation to change the requirement that veterans have to live 40 miles away from a VA facility to receive care locally. She said the impact of the Afghanistan withdrawal, as well as the 20th anniversary of 9/11 on veterans’ mental health has been recognized in a bipartisan fashion. ‘For veterans — the Vietnam war veterans, the Iraq and Afghanistan veterans — this is extraordinarily difficult for them. Their PTSD has worsened, and their mental health has been challenged,’ Miller-Meeks said.” [Daily Iowan, 9/12/21]

Miller-Meeks Expressed Concern About The Impact Of The Afghanistan Withdrawal On Veterans’ Mental Health

September 2021: Miller-Meeks Called On Veterans Affairs Chair Rep. Mark Takano To Hold A Hearing On The Short And Long Term Implications That The Afghanistan Withdrawal Has Had On Veterans’ Mental Health. “Miller-Meeks joined other Republican lawmakers in calling on the Veterans Affairs Chair Rep. Mike Takano, D-California, to hold a hearing on the short and long term implications that the Afghanistan withdrawal has had on veterans’ mental health and to ensure veterans are aware of the resources the VA can provide them. […] She said the impact of the Afghanistan withdrawal, as well as the 20th anniversary of 9/11 on veterans’ mental health has been recognized in a bipartisan fashion. ‘For veterans — the Vietnam war veterans, the Iraq and Afghanistan veterans — this is extraordinarily difficult for them. Their PTSD has worsened, and their mental health has been challenged,’ Miller-Meeks said.” [Daily Iowan, 9/12/21]

September 2021: Miller-Meeks Said Her Staff Was Working On Developing Legislation To Change Limits On Where Veterans Must Live To Receive Local Care From VA Facilities

“Miller-Meeks joined other Republican lawmakers in calling on the Veterans Affairs Chair Rep. Mike Takano, D-California, to hold a hearing on the short and long term implications that the Afghanistan withdrawal has had on veterans’ mental health and to ensure veterans are aware of the resources the VA can provide them. Miller-Meeks also co-sponsored a bipartisan and bicameral piece of legislation to improve the Veteran Crisis Line. She said her staff is working on developing legislation to change the requirement that veterans have to live 40 miles away from a VA facility to receive care locally. She said the impact of the Afghanistan withdrawal, as well as the 20th anniversary of 9/11, on veterans’ mental health has been recognized in a bipartisan fashion. ‘For veterans, the Vietnam War veterans, the Iraq and Afghanistan veterans, this is extraordinarily difficult for them. Their PTSD has worsened, and their mental health has been challenged,’ Miller-Meeks said.” [Daily Iowan, 9/12/21]

Miller-Meeks: “Expanding Health Care Services In Rural America And Among Our Veterans Are Two Of My Top Priorities In Congress.” “All four of Iowa's U.S. House members are supporting the ‘Sgt. Ketchum Rural Veterans’ Mental Health Act,’ which was discussed in a hearing Thursday. The bill's title honors Ketchum, a Davenport veteran who died by suicide in 2016 after being denied inpatient psychiatric care at the Iowa City Veterans Administration Medical Center. […] U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, a Republican who represents southeast Iowa and who is an Air Force veteran, joined the call for the proposal. ‘Expanding health care services in rural America and among our veterans are two of my top priorities in Congress, so I am proud to join the entire Iowa delegation in this effort. We simply have to do better for our veterans, there is no other option,’ Miller-Meeks wrote in this week's joint news release about the bill.” [Des Moines Register, 4/16/21]

July 2021: Miller-Meeks Sponsored A Bill Providing Mammograms For Veterans Who Served In Locations Associated With Toxic Exposure

July 2021: Miller-Meeks Sponsored A Bill Providing Mammograms For Veterans Who Served In Locations Associated With Toxic Exposure. On July 20, 2021, Miller-Meeks sponsored HR 4571, the SERVICE Act of
2021, “A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Under Secretary for Health of the Department of Veterans Affairs to provide mammography screening for veterans who served in locations associated with toxic exposure.” In September 2021, the bill was referred to the Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs. [HR 4571, Sponsored, 7/20/21; CQ, 9/8/21]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>June 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted To Protect Free Access To Contraceptives For Insured Veterans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miller-Meeks Voted For Prohibiting The Veterans Affairs Department From Requiring Copayments From Veterans For Contraceptives That Are Required To Be Covered By Health Insurance. In June 2021, Miller-Meeks Voted For: “Passage of the bill that would prohibit the Veterans Affairs Department from requiring copayments from a veteran for any contraceptive items that are required to be covered by health insurance plans without a cost-sharing requirement.” The bill passed, 245-181. [HR 239, Vote #184, 6/24/21; CQ, 6/24/21]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller-Meeks Voted For A Bill That Prohibits Veterans Affairs From Requiring Co-Pay For Contraceptives That Were Required To Be Covered By Health Insurance Plans Without A Cost-Sharing Requirement. In June 2021, Miller-Meeks voted for: “Takano, D-Calif., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill that would prohibit the Veterans Affairs Department from requiring copayments from a veteran for any contraceptive items that are required to be covered by health insurance plans without a cost-sharing requirement.” The motion passed 240 to 188. [H R 239, Vote #160, 6/15/21; CQ, 6/15/21]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>April 2021: Miller-Meeks Sponsored A Bill Requiring Research On Medical Cannabis For Veterans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 2021: Miller-Meeks Sponsored A Bill Requiring Research On Medical Cannabis For Veterans. On April 30, 2021, Miller-Meeks sponsored HR 2932, the Veterans CARE Act, which “requires the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) to conduct and support research on the efficacy and safety of certain forms of cannabis and cannabis delivery for veterans enrolled in the VA health care system and diagnosed with conditions such as chronic pain or post-traumatic stress disorder.” The bill was read twice and referred to House Veterans' Affairs. [HR 2932, Sponsored, 4/30/21; CQ, 4/30/21]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014: Miller-Meeks Faulted Congress For Not Addressing The Patient-Care Scandals At The VA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miller-Meeks Criticized Congress For Not Addressing The VA Patient-Care Scandals. “Miller-Meeks criticized government overreach […] she faulted Congress for not addressing the patient-care scandals at the Veterans Administration, and the Environmental Protection Agency for what she called a ‘war on coal.’” [The Gazette, 1/12/14]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014: Miller-Meeks Called Resources For Veteran “The One Issue I Will Never Compromise On”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miller-Meeks: “The One Issue I Will Never Compromise On Is Making Sure Our Military Men And Women Have The Resources Needed When They Are Deployed And Proper Services When They Return.” “Mariannette Miller-Meeks: The one issue I will never compromise on is making sure our military men and women have the resources needed when they are deployed and proper services when they return. As a 24-year veteran of the Army and someone who comes from a military family, what has been happening with veterans’ health care makes me sick. It is disgusting that veterans were put on fake waiting lists and denied the health care they deserve. More needs to be done to reform the system and hold those responsible for the scandal.” [Clinton Herald, 10/15/14]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2010: Miller-Meeks Said She Wanted To Ensure Veterans Receive Top Quality Medical Care, Civilian Life Transition Resources, And A Responsive And Efficient Veterans Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
2010: Miller-Meeks said she wanted to ensure veterans receive top quality medical care, sufficient resources for transitioning said she into civilian life, and a Veterans Administration that is responsive and efficient. According to Miller-Meeks for Congress 2010 website under “Victory in the War on Terror, Caring for Our Veterans”, Miller-Meeks said “...it is important that our nation is there for our veterans and welcomes them with open arms when they return home - ensuring top quality medical care, sufficient resources for transitioning into civilian life, and a Veterans Administration that is responsive and efficient. I will be a tireless advocate for our nation’s veterans in Congress.” [Miller-Meeks for Congress 2010, accessed 6/15/20]

### Consumer Protections

**January 2022: Miller-Meeks Voted For An Amendment That Would Replace Most Of The Provisions In The Guard And Reserve GI Bill Parity Act And Increase Borrower Fee Rates For Certain VA Loans**

In January 2022, Miller-Meeks voted for the “Moore R-Ala., amendment no. 2 that would strike the bill's text and replace it with provisions that would expand GI Bill benefits for National Guard and Reserve members by including certain mandatory drills and field exercises, not including training, as eligible active-duty service with respect to educational assistance. As an offset, it would temporarily increase borrower fee rates for VA interest rate reduction housing refinancing loans.” The amendment was rejected by a vote of 198-225. [HR 1836, Vote 4, 1/12/22; CQ, 1/12/22]

- **January 2022: Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Guard And Reserve GI Bill Parity Act, Which Would Expand GI Bill Benefits For National Guard And Reserve Members.** In January 2022, Miller-Meeks voted against the “Passage of the bill that would expand GI Bill benefits for National Guard and Reserve members by including their training as eligible service with respect to educational assistance. It would specify that such benefits accrued through training before Aug. 1, 2025, would expire by Aug. 1, 2040, while benefits accrued through training after that date would not expire. As an offset, it would modify borrower fee rates for certain VA housing loans by delaying certain scheduled rate reductions for several months in 2031 and increasing rates for interest rate reduction refinancing loans closed from July 1, 2022, through Sept. 30, 2030. As amended, the bill would also require the Veterans Affairs Department to provide new veterans with information regarding medical care they are eligible for through VA benefits, including care provided through community providers, mental health care and military sexual trauma care.” Passed by a vote of 287-135. [HR 1836, Vote 6, 1/12/22; CQ, 1/12/22]

**September 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against An Amendment That Would Strengthen Servicemember Consumer Protections Related To Medical Debt And Credit Reporting**

On September 22, 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against the “Tlaib, D-Mich., amendment no. 11 that would strengthen servicemember consumer protections with regard to medical debt collections and credit reporting, including by prohibiting the collection of medical debt for two years after a first payment is due and prohibiting debt arising from medically necessary procedures from ever appearing on servicemember credit reports.” The amendment was adopted 222 to 203. [CQ, 9/22/21; H.R. 4350, Vote 271, 9/22/21]

**June 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted For Imposing Harsher Fines On Those Who Seek To Defraud Veterans**
June 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted For Imposing Harsher Fines On Those Who Seek To Defraud Veterans. In June 2021, Miller-Meeks Voted For: “Nadler, D-N.Y., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended, that would establish fines, prison sentences of up to five years, or both for individuals who engage in schemes to defraud individuals in connection with obtaining veterans' benefits.” The motion was agreed to, 416-5. [HR 983, Vote #174, 6/22/21; CQ, 6/22/21]

Women In The Draft


Miller-Meeks On Women Being Drafted Into The Military: “The Goal Of Our Military Is Not Wokeness. The Goal Of Our Military Is To Protect The Homeland. It’s To Go To War And To Go Into Battle.” Gowdy closed by asking Miller-Meeks her opinion on women being drafted into the military. Citing her own military experience, she recognized that while women do have a place in the military, the focus must always be on the defense of the United States. ‘We have to remember what’s the goal of our military. The goal of our military is not wokeness. The goal of our military is to protect the homeland. It’s to go to war and to go into battle.” [Fox News, 8/2/21]

Military Justice

Miller-Meeks Co-Sponsored The Vanessa Guillén Military Justice Improvement And Increasing Prevention Act, Which Empowered Independent, Trained Military Prosecutors To Handle Serious Military Crimes

Miller-Meeks Co-Sponsored The Vanessa Guillén Military Justice Improvement And Increasing Prevention Act. “Today, June 23rd, 2021, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02), a retired Army Lt. Colonel, joined Reps. Jackie Speier (CA-14), Mike Turner (OH-10), Anthony Brown (MD-04), Trent Kelly (MS-01), Elaine Luria (VA-02), Markwayne Mullin (OK-02), Veronica Escobar (TX-16), Richard Hudson (NC-09), and Sylvia Garcia (TX-29), to introduce the bipartisan Vanessa Guillén Military Justice Improvement and Increasing Prevention Act. This legislation moves the decision to prosecute serious crimes in the military from the chain of command to independent, trained, and professional military prosecutors. This legislation is the House companion to S.1520, which was introduced in April by Sens. Joni Ernst (R-IA), Kirsten Gillibrand (D-NY), and Chuck Grassley (R-IA) and has a total of 65 co-sponsors. ‘As a 24-year Army veteran, I understand the trauma that too many of our servicemembers have endured. What happened to Vanessa, and has happened to so many others, is tragic, and we must do more to keep our servicemembers safe and get them the justice they deserve,’ said Miller-Meeks. ‘I am proud to join such a large and bipartisan group of members to introduce the Vanessa Guillén Military Justice Improvement and Increasing Prevention Act to reform our military justice system for the better. This system has been broken for too long, and the time to act is now.’” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 6/23/21]

Miller-Meeks Press Release: The Vanessa Guillén Military Justice Improvement And Increasing Prevention Act Moved The Decision To Prosecute Serious Crimes In The Military To Independent, Trained Military Prosecutors. “Today, June 23rd, 2021, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02), a retired Army Lt. Colonel, joined Reps. Jackie Speier (CA-14), Mike Turner (OH-10), Anthony Brown (MD-04), Trent Kelly (MS-01), Elaine Luria (VA-02), Markwayne Mullin (OK-02), Veronica Escobar (TX-16), Richard Hudson (NC-09), and Sylvia Garcia (TX-29), to introduce the bipartisan Vanessa Guillén Military Justice Improvement and Increasing Prevention Act. This legislation moves the decision to prosecute serious crimes in the military from the chain of command to independent, trained, and professional military prosecutors. This legislation is the House companion to S.1520, which was introduced in April by Sens. Joni Ernst (R-IA), Kirsten Gillibrand (D-NY), and Chuck Grassley (R-IA) and has a total of 65 co-sponsors. ‘As a 24-year Army veteran, I understand the trauma that too many of our
servicemembers have endured. What happened to Vanessa, and has happened to so many others, is tragic, and we must do more to keep our servicemembers safe and get them the justice they deserve,’ said Miller-Meeks. ‘I am proud to join such a large and bipartisan group of members to introduce the Vanessa Guillén Military Justice Improvement and Increasing Prevention Act to reform our military justice system for the better. This system has been broken for too long, and the time to act is now.’” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, 6/23/21]

October 2021: Miller-Meeks Sponsored A Bill Updating A Program For Veterans Who Have Had Experience With The Criminal Justice System

October 2021: Miller-Meeks Sponsored A Bill Updating A Program For Veterans Who Have Had Experience With The Criminal Justice System. On October 8, 2021, Miller-Meeks sponsored HR 5529, the Veterans Justice Outreach Improvement Act, which “updates the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) Veterans Justice Outreach Program, which is a program through which the VA identifies justice-involved veterans and provides them with access to VA services. Justice-involved veterans are those with active, ongoing, or recent contact with some component of a local criminal justice system. Specifically, the bill requires the VA to conduct program outreach to justice-involved veterans, military and veterans service organizations, and relevant stakeholders in the criminal justice community (e.g., local law enforcement). The VA must increase the number of program specialists responsible for supporting justice-involved veterans in rural, remote, or underserved areas. Additionally, the VA must establish performance goals, measures, and implementation time lines for the program, specialists, and providing support for research regarding justice-involved veterans. Program specialists must receive training, at least annually, on (1) veteran eligibility for the program, and (2) best practices for identifying and conducting outreach to justice-involved veterans and relevant stakeholders in the criminal justice community.” On November 4, 2021, the bill underwent committee consideration and markup held by the House Veterans’ Affairs Committee. [HR 5529, Sponsored, 10/8/21; CQ, 11/4/21]

April 2021: Miller-Meeks Sponsored A Bill Requiring Controlled Substance Drop Sites In VA Medical Facilities That Passed The House Unanimously

April 2021: Miller-Meeks Sponsored A Bill Requiring Controlled Substance Drop Sites In VA Medical Facilities. On April 15, 2021, Miller-Meeks sponsored HR 2591, the DUMP Opioids Act, which “requires the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) to ensure that each VA medical facility with an on-site pharmacy or a physical location dedicated for law enforcement purposes has a physical location where any individual may dispose of controlled substances medications.” The bill was read twice and referred to House Veterans' Affairs Committee. [HR 2591, Sponsored, 4/15/21; CQ, 4/15/21]

- Miller-Meeks Voted For Directing The Secretary Of Veterans Affairs To Ensure That Certain Veterans Medical Facilities Have Physical Locations For The Disposal Of Controlled Substances Medications. In July 2021, voted for: “Takano, D-Calif., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill that would require the Veterans Affairs Department to ensure each of its medical facilities that has an onsite pharmacy or a location dedicated for law enforcement purposes has a physical location where any individual may dispose of controlled substances medications. It would require the VA to designate periods during which the public may make use of the location and authorize the department to carry out public information campaigns regarding such periods.” The motion was agreed to 424 to 0. [S 957, Vote #224, 7/27/21; CQ, 7/27/21]

Salaries
**2009: Miller-Meeks Said That If Soldiers Were Not Given A Pay Raise She Would Refuse Any Salary Increase As A Member Of Congress**

Miller-Meeks said if elected, if soldiers were not given a pay raise she would refuse any salary increase. “If elected, I guarantee that if we do not give a pay raise to soldiers or a cost-of-living increase to senior citizens that I would refuse any salary increase and any additional revenues provided to run a congressional office,” Miller-Meeks said.” [The Hawk Eye, 12/1/09]